arXiv:1211.0672v2 [math.CA] 6 Nov 2012

A CHARACTERIZATION OF COMPACTNESS FOR SINGULAR INTEGRALS

KARL-MIKAEL PERFEKT, PACO VILLARROYA, AND SANDRA POTT

Abstract. We prove a $T(1)$-type theorem which characterizes the compactness of Calderón-Zygmund operators whose kernels satisfy additional, but arbitrary in size, decay and smoothness conditions. The methods characterize the compactness of singular integral operators acting on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, $1 < p < \infty$, and also give an endpoint result analogue to the case $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ of the classical $T(1)$ theory. The generality of the result is illustrated by proving the compactness of certain perturbations of the Cauchy integral on curves with normal derivatives satisfying a VMO-condition.

1. Introduction

The theory of singular integrals started with the study of singular convolution operators such as the Hilbert and Riesz transforms. David and Journé's famous $T(1)$ theorem [4] marked significant progress in the theory, characterizing the boundedness of a larger class of singular integral operators, including operators of non-convolution type. In contrast with convolution operators, some of these operators are compact. Well known examples include certain Hankel operators [12], commutators of singular integrals and multiplication operators [14], and layer potential operators [5]. The study of compactness of singular integral operators has been an area of active research, and continues to be so today with a variety of applications, many in the field of elliptic partial differential equations [8].

The purpose of this paper is to develop a general theory of compactness for a large class of singular integral operators that, in the spirit of David and Journé, describes when an operator is compact in terms of its action on special families of functions. We actually present a new $T(1)$ theorem which completely characterizes the compactness of singular integral operators, in analogy with the characterization of their boundedness given by the classical $T(1)$ theorem. More precisely, we show that a singular integral operator T is compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ if and only if it satisfies a new property of *weak compactness*, analogue to the classical *weak boundedness*, and the functions $T(1)$ and $T^*(1)$ belong

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B20, 42B25, 42C40.

Key words and phrases. Singular integral, Calderón-Zygmund operator, Compact operator, Cauchy integral.

The second author has been partially supported by project MTM2011-23164.

to the space CMO($\mathbb{R}$), the appropriate substitute of BMO($\mathbb{R}$). Our hypotheses impose additional smoothness bounds on the kernel of T, beyond it being of Calderón-Zygmund type. However, the additional smoothness and decay can be of arbitrary size, and hence fully singular kernels are within the scope of our theorem. As an illustration, we prove the compactness of certain perturbations of the Cauchy integral operator on Lipschitz curves with CMO-smooth normal derivatives.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2, we give necessary definitions and state our main result, Theorem 2.19; in Section 3 we provide the application to perturbations of the Cauchy integral; in Section 4 we prove the necessity of the hypotheses of Theorem 2.19; all remaining sections are devoted to prove their sufficiency. In Section 5, we prove a fundamental lemma describing the action of the operator on bump functions. In Section 6, we demonstrate compactness on L^p, $1 < p < \infty$, under special cancellation conditions. In Section 7, we construct the paraproducts which allow us to obtain compactness in full generality. Finally, in Section 8, we extend the results to the $L^\infty \cap \mathrm{CMO} \to \mathrm{CMO}$ endpoint case, which is needed for the application in Section 3.

We express our gratitude in chronological order to Sandy Davie, Xavier Tolsa, Christoph Thiele, Tuomas Hytönen, Fernando Soria, Ignacio Uriarte and Andrei Stoica for their suggestions and comments which led to substantial improvements of this paper. Further, the second author would like to especially thank Ja Young Kim for many interesting conversations.

2. DEFINITIONS AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULT

Definition 2.1. *We will say that three measurable functions $L, S, D : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ constitute a set of admissible functions if they are bounded and the following limits hold*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} L(x) = \lim_{x\to 0} S(x) = \lim_{x\to\infty} D(x) = 0 \tag{1}$$

Remark 2.2. *Since any fixed dilation of an admissible function $L_\lambda(x) = L(\lambda^{-1}x)$ is again admissible, we will often omit all universal constants appearing in the argument of these functions.*

Definition 2.3. *Let Δ be the diagonal of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let L, S, D be admissible functions.*

A function $K : (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta) \to \mathbb{C}$ is called a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel if $\lim_{|x-t|\to\infty} K(x,t) = 0$, and for some $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $C > 0$, we have

$$|K(x,t) - K(x',t')| \leq C \frac{(|x-x'| + |t-t'|)^\delta}{|x-t|^{1+\delta}} L(|x-t|) S(|x-t|) D(|x+t|)$$

whenever $2(|x-x'| + |t-t'|) < |x-t|$.

We remark that there is an equivalent definition of compact Calderón-Zygmund kernels which is more convenient to use in applications of the theory (see Section 3). As we will see in greater detail in Section 4.2, K fulfilling the smoothness hypothesis of Definition 2.3 is equivalent to the existence of a bounded function $B : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{|x-t|\to\infty} B(x,t) = \lim_{|x-t|\to 0} B(x,t) = \lim_{|x+t|\to\infty} B(x,t) = 0$$

and for some $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $C > 0$,

$$|K(x,t) - K(x',t')| \leq C\frac{(|x-x'| + |t-t'|)^{\delta}}{|x-t|^{1+\delta}} B(x,t)$$

whenever $2(|x-x'| + |t-t'|) < |x-t|$.

Moreover, in order to simplify notation, we will often write

$$F(x,t) = L(|x-t|)S(|x-t|)D(|x+t|)$$

We start with a technical lemma showing that the smoothness condition of the kernel K automatically implies the expected decay. This explains why our definition of compact kernel does not involve a decay condition stronger than convergence to zero when $|x-t|$ tends to infinity. Note that the proof in fact works for classical standard Calderón-Zygmund kernels as well.

Lemma 2.4. *Let K be a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel as given in Definition 2.3. Then*

$$|K(x,t)| \leq \frac{1}{|x-t|}\tilde{F}(x,t)$$

for all $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta$, with a possibly different function $\tilde{F}$ of the same type as F.

Proof. For every fixed $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta$ we denote by $B_{x,t}$ the set the points $(x',t') \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta$ such that $2(|x-x'| + |t-t'|) < |x-t|$, that is, the closed l^1-norm ball with centre (x,t) and radius $|x-t|/2$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
|K(x,t)| &\leq |K(x',t')| + |K(x,t) - K(x',t')| \\
&\leq |K(x',t')| + \frac{(|x-x'| + |t-t'|)^{\delta}}{|x-t|^{1+\delta}} L(|x-t|)S(|x-t|)D(|x+t|) \\
&\leq |K(x',t')| + 2^{-\delta}\frac{1}{|x-t|}F(x,t)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $(x',t') \in B_{x,t}$. Therefore

$$|K(x,t)| \leq \inf_{B_{x,t}} |K(x',t')| + \frac{C}{|x-t|}F(x,t)$$

Now we fix $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta$. By symmetry we can assume that $x > t$. Then, for fixed $0 < \epsilon < 1/3$, we consider the sequence $\{(x_n, t_n)\}_{n\geq 0} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta$ defined by $x_0 = x$, $t_0 = t$ and

$$x_n = x_{n-1} + (1-\epsilon)/4|x_{n-1} - t_{n-1}|$$

$$t_n = t_{n-1} - (1-\epsilon)/4|x_{n-1} - t_{n-1}|$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Notice that this way $(x_n, t_n) \in B_{x_{n-1},t_{n-1}}$ and so, by previous calculations,

$$|K(x,t)| \leq |K(x_1,t_1)| + \frac{C}{|x_0 - t_0|}F(x_0,t_0)$$

$$\leq |K(x_2,t_2)| + \frac{C}{|x_1 - t_1|}F(x_1,t_1) + \frac{C}{|x_0 - t_0|}F(x_0,t_0)$$

and by recursion,

$$|K(x,t)| \leq |K(x_n,t_n)| + C\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{|x_k - t_k|}F(x_k,t_k)$$

Moreover

$$|x_n - t_n| = |x_{n-1} - t_{n-1} + (1-\epsilon)/2|x_{n-1} - t_{n-1}||$$

$$= (3-\epsilon)/2|x_{n-1} - t_{n-1}| = ((3-\epsilon)/2)^n|x_0 - t_0| > (4/3)^n|x - t|$$

while

$$|x_n + t_n| = |x_{n-1} + t_{n-1}| = |x_0 + t_0| = |x + t|$$

Therefore,

$$|K(x,t)| \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} |K(x_n,t_n)| + C\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(4/3)^k|x-t|}F(x_k,t_k)$$

with

$$F(x_k,t_k) = L(|x_k - t_k|)S(|x_k - t_k|)D(|x_k + t_k|)$$

$$= L((3-\epsilon)/2)^k|x-t|)S((3-\epsilon)/2)^k|x-t|)D(|x+t|)$$

This finally shows that

$$|K(x,t)| \leq \frac{1}{|x-t|}\tilde{F}(x,t)$$

with $\tilde{F}(x,t) = C\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(4/3)^k}F(x_k,t_k)$. Notice that an application of Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem shows that the function $\tilde{F}$ satisfies the same limit properties as F.

Remark 2.5. *When $\delta = 1$ and the kernel K is differentiable away from the diagonal, the smoothness condition is satisfied if we assume the stronger hypothesis*

$$|\partial_t K(x,t)| + |\partial_x K(x,t)| \leq \frac{1}{|x-t|^2}F(x,t)$$

Definition 2.6. *Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ be a linear operator which is continuous, where $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ is equipped with the Schwartz topology and $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ with the dual topology of tempered distributions. We say that T is associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel K if the action of $T(f)$ as a distribution satisfies the following integral representation*

$$\langle T(f), g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)g(x)K(x,t)\,dt\,dx$$

for all Schwartz functions $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ with disjoint compact supports.

Definition 2.7. *For every interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ we denote its centre by $c(I)$ and its length by $|I|$. Then, for $0 < p \leq \infty$, we say that a Schwartz function ϕ is an $L^p(\mathbb{R})$-normalized bump function adapted to I with constant $C > 0$ and order $N \in \mathbb{N}$, if it satisfies*

$$|\phi^{(n)}(x)| \leq C|I|^{-1/p-n}(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{-N}, \quad 0 \leq n \leq N$$

Observe that these bump functions are normalized to be uniformly bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. The order of the bump functions will always be denoted by N, even though its value might change from line to line. We will often use the greek letters ϕ, φ for general bump functions while we reserve the use of ψ to denote bump functions with mean zero. If not otherwise stated, we will usually assume that bump functions are $L^2(\mathbb{R})$-normalized.

In Proposition 5.7, we use the same concept for functions of two variables. By this we simply mean that the function satisfies the corresponding bounds of product tensor type:

$$|\partial_1^{n_1}\partial_2^{n_2}\phi(x_1, x_2)| \leq C \prod_{i=1,2} |I_i|^{-1/2-n_i}(1+|I_i|^{-1}|x_i-c(I_i)|)^{-N}, \quad 0 \leq n \leq N$$

A result we will often use is the following property of bump functions whose proof can be found in [13]:

Lemma 2.8. *Let I, J be intervals and let ϕ_I, φ_J be bump functions L^2-adapted to I and J respectively with order N and constant $C > 0$. Then,*

$$|\langle \phi_I, \varphi_J\rangle| \leq C \left(\frac{\min(|I|, |J|)}{\max(|I|, |J|)}\right)^{1/2} \big(\max(|I|, |J|)^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)\big)^{-N}$$

Moreover, if $|J| \leq |I|$ and ψ_J has mean zero then

$$|\langle \phi_I, \psi_J\rangle| \leq C \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2} \big(|I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)\big)^{-(N-1)}$$

Notation 2.9. *To clarify the previous result, we introduce some notation which will be frequently used throughout the paper. We denote by $\mathbb{B} = [-1/2, 1/2]$ and $\mathbb{B}_\lambda = \lambda\mathbb{B} = [-\lambda/2, \lambda/2]$. Given two intervals*

$I, J \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define $\langle I, J\rangle$ as the smallest interval containing $I \cup J$ and we denote its measure by $\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)$*, that is,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) &\approx |I|/2 + |c(I) - c(J)| + |J|/2\\ &\approx |I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, J) + |J|\\ &\approx \max(|I|, |J|) + \mathrm{dist}(I, J)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{dist}(I, J)$ *denotes the set distance between I and J. Actually,*

$$|I|/2+|c(I)-c(J)|+|J|/2 \leq \mathrm{diam}(I\cup J) \leq 2(|I|/2+|c(I)-c(J)|+|J|/2)$$

and

$$2^{-1}(|I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, J) + |J|) \leq \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) \leq |I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, J) + |J|$$

We also define the relative distance between I and J by $\mathrm{rdist}(I, J) = \max(|I|, |J|)^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)$*, which essentially is the number of times the larger interval needs to be shifted so that it contains the smaller one. Notice that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{rdist}(I, J) &\approx 1 + \max(|I|, |J|)^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|\\ &\approx 1 + \max(|I|, |J|)^{-1}\mathrm{dist}(I, J)\end{aligned}$$

Given a rectangle in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $I \times J$, we define its eccentricity as

$$\mathrm{ec}(I, J) = \frac{\min(|I|, |J|)}{\max(|I|, |J|)}$$

Definition 2.10. *We say that a linear operator $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the weak compactness condition, if there exist admissible functions L, S, D such that: for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for any interval I and every pair ϕ_I, φ_I of L^2-normalized bump functions adapted to I with constant $C > 0$ and order N, we have*

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| \lesssim C(L(2^{-M}|I|)S(2^M|I|)D(M^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})) + \epsilon)$$

where the implicit constant only depends on the operator T.

From now on, we will denote

$$F_K(I) = L_K(|I|)S_K(|I|)D_K(\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}))$$

and

$$F_W(I; M) = L_W(2^{-M}|I|)S_W(2^M|I|)D_W(M^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))$$

where L_K, S_K and D_K are the functions appearing in the definition of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel, while L_W, S_W, D_W and the constant M are as in the definition of the weak compactness condition. Note that the value $M = M_{T,\epsilon}$ depends not only on T but also on ϵ.

We will also denote $F(I; M) = F_K(I) + F_W(I; M)$,

$$F_K(I_1, \cdots, I_n) = \big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} L_K(|I_i|)\big)\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_K(|I_i|)\big)\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_K(\,\mathrm{rdist}(I_i, \mathbb{B}))\big)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_W(I_1,\cdots,I_n;M) &= \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} L_W(2^{-M}|I_i|)\Big)\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_W(2^{M}|I_i|)\Big) \\ &\quad \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_W(M^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I_i,\mathbb{B}))\Big) \end{aligned}$$

and $F(I_1,\cdots,I_n;M) = F_K(I_1,\cdots,I_n) + F_W(I_1,\cdots,I_n;M)$.

In order to prove our main results about compact singular integral operators, we will use the following characterization of compact operators in a Banach space with a Schauder basis (see for example [6]).

Theorem 2.11. *Suppose that $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Schauder basis of a Banach space E. For each positive integer k, let P_k be the canonical projection,*

$$P_k\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\alpha_n e_n\Big) = \sum_{n\leq k}\alpha_n e_n$$

Then, a bounded linear operator $T : E \to E$ is compact if and only if $P_k \circ T$ converges to T in operator norm.

Definition 2.12. *For every $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{I}_M$ be the family of intervals such that $2^{-M} \leq |I| \leq 2^M$ and $\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \leq M$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the family of dyadic intervals of the real line. We also define $\mathcal{D}_M$ as the intersection of $\mathcal{I}_M$ with $\mathcal{D}$. For every fixed M, we will call the intervals in $\mathcal{I}_M$ and $\mathcal{D}_M$ as lagom intervals and dyadic lagom intervals respectively.*

Notice that $I \in \mathcal{D}_M$ implies that $2^{-M}(2^M + |c(I)|) \leq M$ and then $|c(I)| \leq (M-1)2^M$. Therefore, $I \subset \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}$ with $2^{-M} \leq |I|$.

On the other hand, $I \notin \mathcal{D}_M$ implies either $|I| > 2^M$ or $|I| < 2^{-M}$ or $2^{-M} \leq |I| \leq 2^M$ with $|c(I)| > (M-1)2^M$.

Let E be one of the following Banach spaces: the Lebesgue space $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, $1 < p < \infty$, the Hardy space $H^1(\mathbb{R})$, or the space $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$, to be introduced later as the closure in $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity. In each case, E is equipped with smooth wavelet bases which are also Schauder bases (see [7] and Lemma 2.16). Moreover, in all cases, we have at our disposal smooth and compactly supported wavelet bases.

Definition 2.13. *Let E be one of the previously mentioned Banach spaces. Let $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a wavelet basis of E. Then, for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the lagom projection operator P_M by*

$$P_M(f) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M}\langle f,\psi_I\rangle\psi_I$$

where $\langle f,\psi_I\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\overline{\psi(x)}dx$.

We also define the orthogonal lagom projection operator as $P_M^{\perp}(f) = f - P_M(f)$.

Remark 2.14. *Without explicit mention, we will let the wavelet basis defining P_M vary from proof to proof to suit our technical needs.*

We also note the use of the same notation for the action of $T(f)$ as a distribution and the inner product. We hope that this will not cause confusion.

It is easy to see that both P_M and $P_M^\perp$ are self-adjoint operators since

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f, P_M(g)\rangle &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\langle\psi_I, P_M(g)\rangle\\ &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M} \langle P_M(f), \psi_I\rangle\langle\psi_i, g\rangle = \langle P_M(f), g\rangle\end{aligned}$$

We notice the difference with the usual projection operator, $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ for every measurable set $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_\Omega(f) = \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{D}\\ I\subset\Omega}} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\psi_I$$

Let S denote the square function associated with a wavelet basis

$$S(f)(x) = \Big(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{|\langle f, \psi_I\rangle|^2}{|I|}\chi_I(x)\Big)^{1/2}$$

Since we trivially have the pointwise estimates $S(P_M(f))(x) \leq S(f)(x)$ and $S(P_M^\perp(f))(x) \leq S(f)(x)$, by Littlewood-Paley theory, we deduce that the lagom projection operator and its orthogonal projection are both continuous on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for all $1 < p < \infty$. Moreover, the estimate

$$\|P_M(f)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} = \sup_{\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}} \Big(\frac{1}{|\Omega|}\sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{D}_M\\ I\subset\Omega}} |\langle f, \psi_I\rangle|^2\Big)^{1/2} \leq \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}$$

shows that P_M is also bounded on $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ and, by duality, on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with $\|P_M\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})\to\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$ and $\|P_M\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})\to H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$. For similar reasons, we also have $\|P_M^\perp\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})\to\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$ and $\|P_M^\perp\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})\to H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$

We remark that in E, the equality

$$P_M^\perp(f) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M^c} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\psi_I \tag{2}$$

is to be interpreted in its Schauder basis sense,

$$\lim_{M'\to\infty} \|P_M^\perp(f) - \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_{M'}\backslash\mathcal{D}_M} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\psi_I\|_E = 0$$

Note that according to Theorem 2.11, an operator $T : E \to E$, is compact if and only if

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \|P_M^\perp \circ T\| = 0$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm.

We provide now the definition and main properties of the space to which the function $T(1)$ must belong if T is compact.

Definition 2.15. *We define* $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *as the closure in* $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *of the space of continuous functions vanishing at infinity.*

The next lemma gives the two main characterizations of $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$: the first in terms of the average deviation from the mean, and the second in terms of a wavelet decomposition. See [12] for the first, and [10] for the second characterization.

Lemma 2.16. *i)* $f \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *if and only if* $f \in \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *and*

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \sup_{I\notin\mathcal{I}_M} \frac{1}{|I|}\int_I |f(x)-f_I|dx = 0 \tag{3}$$

where $f_I = \frac{1}{|I|}\int_I f(x)dx$.

ii) $f \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *if and only if* $f \in \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *and*

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \|P_M^{\perp}(f)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} = 0 \tag{4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_M^{\perp}(f)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} &= \sup_{\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|\Omega|^{1/2}}\|P_\Omega(P_M^{\perp}(f))\|_2 \\ &= \sup_{\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}} \Big(\frac{1}{|\Omega|}\sum_{\substack{I\notin\mathcal{D}_M\\ I\subset\Omega}} |\langle f,\psi_I\rangle|^2\Big)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ *is a Schauder basis for* $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

We will mainly be using the wavelet decomposition formulation.

Remark 2.17. *Considering the comment after Definition 2.12, we see that the preceding lemma is also true if we, in line with* [12], *replace* $\mathcal{I}_M$ *by* $\mathcal{I}'_M$ *consisting of those intervals* I *such that* $2^{-M} \le |I| \le 2^M$ *and* $|c(I)| \le M/2$, *and* $\mathcal{D}_M$ *by* $\mathcal{D}'_M = \mathcal{I}'_M \cap \mathcal{D}$.

As the final notational detail of this section, we have the following definition.

Definition 2.18. *We denote by* $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ *the closed subspace* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})\cap \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ *of* L^∞.

We now give the statement of our main result, leaving for forthcoming sections the exact meaning of $T(1)$ and $T^*(1)$.

Theorem 2.19. *Let* T *be a linear operator associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel.*

Then T *extends to a compact operator on* $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ *for all* p *with* $1 < p < \infty$ *if and only if* T *satisfies the weak compactness condition and the cancellation conditions* $T(1), T^*(1) \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

Under the same hypotheses, T is also compact as a map from $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ into $\mathrm{CMO}(mathbbR)$. Moreover, with the extra assumption $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$, T is compact on $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

Remark 2.20. *As a reference, we state that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is an $M_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $M > M_0$,*

$$\|P_M^\perp \circ T\|_{p\to p} \le CC_p\Big(C_{\delta'}(C_K+C_W)\big(C(\sup_{I\notin \mathcal{D}_M} F(I;M_0)+\epsilon)+M^{-\delta'}\|F\|_\infty\big)$$
$$+\|(P_M^\perp \circ T)(1)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} + \|(P_M^\perp \circ T^*)(1)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}\Big)$$

where C is a universal constant, C_p is the constant of boundedness of the square function on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, $C_{\delta'}$ a constant depending on $0 < \delta' < \delta \le 1$, being δ the exponent in the Definition 2.3 of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel, and C_K and C_W are the constants appearing in the definitions of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel and the weak compactness condition, respectively.

3. Applications

In this section we apply our main theorem to demonstrate the compactness of a certain perturbation of the Cauchy transform, for Lipschitz paths in the complex plane satisfying a CMO-condition. The example illustrates with special clarity the scope and methodology of the new theory since the computations involved are essentially variations of the well known calculations pertaining to the study of the Cauchy transform in the classical $T(1)$-theory. We note that a $T(b)$-theorem for compactness in several dimensions is already under development, and it could be of further use in the compactness theory of Cauchy-type operators.

Let $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be an absolutely continuous function such that $A' \in L^\infty \cap \mathrm{CMO}$, and let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the curve given by the parametrization $z(t) = t + iA(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Given points $z(x), z(t) \in \Gamma$, we denote by $\sigma_{z(x),z(t)}, \tau_{z(x),z(t)} \in \Gamma$ the points

$$\sigma_{z(x),z(t)} = z\left(x - \frac{1}{4}(x-t)\right), \quad \tau_{z(x),z(t)} = z\left(x - \frac{3}{4}(x-t)\right),$$

lying in between $z(x)$ and $z(t)$ with respect to the parametrization of Γ.

The application we present concerns a perturbation of the Cauchy transform associated with Γ. Namely, define $T_\Gamma : L^p(\Gamma) \to L^p(\Gamma)$ by

$$T_\Gamma f(z) = 2\int_\Gamma \frac{f(w)}{z - w + 2\overline{(\sigma_{z,w} - \tau_{z,w})}}\, ds(w), \quad f \in L^p(\Gamma),\ z \in \Gamma,$$

where ds denotes arc length measure on Γ. Note that if $z = z(x)$ and $w = z(t)$, then

$$\mathrm{Re}\,(z - w + 2\overline{(\sigma_{z,w} - \tau_{z,w})}) = 2\mathrm{Re}\,(z-w),$$

and

$$\text{(5)}\quad \operatorname{Im}(z-w+2\overline{(\sigma_{z,w}-\tau_{z,w})}) = \\ A(x)-A(t)-2A(x-\frac{1}{4}(x-t))+2A(x-\frac{3}{4}(x-t))$$

In analogy with the Hilbert transform, we also introduce the operator $H_\Gamma : L^p(\Gamma) \to L^p(\Gamma)$,

$$H_\Gamma f(z) = \int_\Gamma \frac{f(w)}{\operatorname{Re}(z-w)}\, ds(w), \quad f \in L^p(\Gamma),\, z \in \Gamma.$$

One might surmise that there is a sufficient amount of cancellation in (5) to cause $T_\Gamma - H_\Gamma$ to be compact on $L^p(\Gamma)$. We will apply the results of this paper to prove exactly this when $\|A'\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that* $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is absolutely continuous, and that* $A' \in L^\infty \cap \mathrm{CMO}$. *Then, there exists an* $\eta > 0$ *such that* $T_\Gamma - H_\Gamma$ *is compact on* $L^p(\Gamma)$, $1 < p < \infty$, *whenever* $\|A'\|_\infty < \eta$.

Moving over to the real line, we have formally that

$$\text{(6)}\qquad (T_\Gamma f - H_\Gamma f)(z(t)) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-i}{2}\right)^n T_n\left(f \cdot \sqrt{1+|A'|^2}\right)(t),$$

where $T_n : L^p(\mathbb{R}) \to L^p(\mathbb{R})$ is the operator associated to the kernel

$$K_n(x,t) = \frac{(A(x)-A(t)-2A(x-\frac{1}{4}(x-t))+2A(x-\frac{3}{4}(x-t)))^n}{(x-t)^{n+1}}.$$

The expression for K_1 is reminiscent of a double difference of A. Operators associated to such kernels have received attention by Coifman and Meyer [2]. Note that K_n is anti-symmetric for each n. In what follows, we will prove that each K_n is a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel and that T_n satisfies the weak compactness condition with appropriate bounds. Moreover, through an inductive procedure, we shall compute $T_n(1)$ and check its membership to CMO. This way, we will deduce that T_n is compact and obtain the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|T_n\|_{L^p \to L^p} \le C^n \|A'\|_\infty^n$. Then, by setting $\eta = 2/C$, we will have finally proven Proposition 3.1.

Note that we may write

$$K_n(x,t) = \frac{1}{x-t}\left(\frac{\int_t^x A'(z)\,dz}{x-t} - \frac{\int_{x-\frac{3}{4}(x-t)}^{x-\frac{1}{4}(x-t)} A'(z)\,dz}{\frac{1}{2}(x-t)}\right)^n.$$

The inner expression can be interpeted as the difference of two averages of A'. From the estimate

$$|f_I - f_J| \le \frac{1}{|J|}\int_J |f - f_I|\,dt \le \frac{2}{|I|}\int_I |f-f_I|\,dt,$$

where $J \subset I$ are two intervals such that $|I| = 2|J|$ and f_I denotes the average of f on I, we deduce

$$|K_n(x,t)| \lesssim 2^n \|A'\|^n_{\mathrm{BMO}} \frac{1}{|x-t|}. \tag{7}$$

Demonstrating the smoothness condition of Definition 2.3 is more involved. Let $x, t, t' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < 2|t-t'| \leq |x-t|$. We denote $G_n(x,t) = (x-t)^{n+1} K_n(x,t)$ for notational convenience and notice that

$$K_n(x,t) - K_n(x,t') = \\ G_n(x,t') \left(\frac{(x-t')^{n+1} - (x-t)^{n+1}}{(x-t)^{n+1}(x-t')^{n+1}} \right) + \frac{G_n(x,t) - G_n(x,t')}{(x-t)^{n+1}}.$$

Regarding the first term of this decomposition, there exists, by the mean value theorem, a λ between t and t', and therefore satisfying $|t-\lambda| < |t-t'|$, such that

$$G_n(x,t') \left(\frac{(x-t')^{n+1} - (x-t)^{n+1}}{(x-t)^{n+1}(x-t')^{n+1}} \right) = \\ (n+1) \frac{G_n(x,t')}{(x-t')^n} \frac{(x-\lambda)^n}{(x-t)^n} \frac{t-t'}{(x-t)(x-t')}.$$

For $M > 0$, let

$$F_{1,n}(M) = \sup_{\substack{I_{x,t} \in \mathcal{I}_M^c \\ 2|t-t'| \leq |x-t|}} \left| \frac{G_n(x,t')}{(x-t')^n} \right|,$$

where $I_{x,t}$ is the interval with endpoints x and t, and $\mathcal{I}_M$ is the set of intervals I with center $c(I)$ such that $2^{-M} < |I| < 2^M$ and $|c(I)| < \frac{M}{2}$. Clearly $F_{1,n}$ is decreasing, and from the assumption that $A' \in \mathrm{CMO}$ in conjunction with the estimate (7) it follows that $\|F_{1,n}\|_\infty \lesssim 2^n \|A'\|^n_{\mathrm{BMO}}$ and $\lim_{M \to \infty} F_{1,n}(M) = 0$. This gives us control of the first term,

$$\left| G_n(x,t') \left(\frac{(x-t')^{n+1} - (x-t)^{n+1}}{(x-t)^{n+1}(x-t')^{n+1}} \right) \right| \\ \lesssim (n+1) \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^n F_{1,n} \left(\max \left(\left| \log_2(|x-t|) \right|, |x+t| \right) \right) \frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}.$$

To deal with the second term we will consider the cases $n = 1$ and $n \geq 2$ separately. Suppose first that $n \geq 2$. Applying the mean value theorem, there exists a λ with

$$|A(t) + 2A(x - \frac{1}{4}(x-t)) - 2A(x - \frac{3}{4}(x-t)) - \lambda| < |G_1(x,t) - G_1(x,t')|$$

and such that

$$\frac{G_n(x,t) - G_n(x,t')}{(x-t)^{n+1}} = n \frac{G_1(x,t) - G_1(x,t')}{t-t'} \frac{(A(x) - \lambda)^{n-1}}{(x-t)^{n-1}} \frac{t-t'}{(x-t)^2}.$$

At this point the condition $A' \in L^\infty$ comes into play, since it is necessary for estimating the first factor;

$$\left| \frac{G_1(x,t) - G_1(x,t')}{t-t'} \right| \lesssim \|A'\|_\infty.$$

On the other hand, introducing

$$F_{2,n}(M) = \sup_{\substack{I_{x,t} \in \mathcal{I}_M^c \\ 2|t-t'| \le |x-t|}} \left| \frac{A(x) - \lambda}{x-t} \right|^{n-1},$$

we have that $A' \in \mathrm{CMO}$ again implies that $\|F_{2,n}\|_\infty \lesssim 4^n \|A'\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}^n$ and $\lim\limits_{M\to\infty} F_{2,n}(M) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{G_n(x,t) - G_n(x,t')}{(x-t)^{n+1}} \right| \lesssim \\ n\|A'\|_\infty F_{2,n}\left(\max\left(\left|\log_2(|x-t|)\right|, |x+t|\right)\right) \frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}.$$

When $n = 1$, the previous argument fails. Instead, we pick a δ, $0 < \delta < 1$, and write

$$\left| \frac{G_1(x,t) - G_1(x,t')}{(x-t)^2} \right| = \left| \frac{G_1(x,t) - G_1(x,t')}{t-t'} \right| \frac{|t-t'|^{1-\delta}}{|x-t|^{1-\delta}} \frac{|t-t'|^{\delta}}{|x-t|^{1+\delta}}.$$

Define

$$F_{2,1}(M) = \sup_{\substack{I_{x,t} \in \mathcal{I}_M^c \\ 2|t-t'| \le |x-t|}} \left| \frac{G_1(x,t) - G_1(x,t')}{t-t'} \right| \frac{|t-t'|^{1-\delta}}{|x-t|^{1-\delta}}.$$

It is clear that $\|F_{2,1}\|_\infty \lesssim \|A'\|_\infty$. We prove now that $\lim_{M\to\infty} F_{2,1}(M) = 0$. For suppose that $\overline{\lim}_{M\to\infty} F_{2,1}(M) = \ell > 0$. Then there exists a sequence (M_k) with $M_k \to \infty$ and corresponding sequences (x_k), (t_k), and (t'_k) such that $I_{x_k,t_k} \in \mathcal{I}_{M_k}^c$, $2|t_k - t'_k| \le |x_k - t_k|$, and

$$\left| \frac{G_1(x_k,t_k) - G_1(x_k,t'_k)}{t_k - t'_k} \right| \frac{|t_k - t'_k|^{1-\delta}}{|x_k - t_k|^{1-\delta}} > \ell/2. \tag{8}$$

There could not exist a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{|t_k - t'_k|}{|x_k - t_k|} \ge C$$

for all k, for then

$$\left| \frac{G_1(x_k,t_k) - G_1(x_k,t'_k)}{t_k - t'_k} \right| \frac{|t_k - t'_k|^{1-\delta}}{|x_k - t_k|^{1-\delta}} \le \\ \frac{2^{1-\delta}}{C} \left| \frac{G_1(x_k,t_k) - G_1(x_k,t'_k)}{x_k - t_k} \right| \to 0,\ k \to \infty,$$

by the fact that $A' \in \mathrm{CMO}$. Hence it must be that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{|t_k - t'_k|}{|x_k - t_k|} = 0.$$

This also contradicts (8), however, since the first factor of the left hand side is bounded, seeing as $A' \in L^\infty$. By this contradiction we conclude that $\lim_{M\to\infty} F_{1,2}(M) = 0$.

Appealing to these estimates and the anti-symmetry of K_n we may easily construct a set of admissible functions L_n, S_n and D_n so that the conditions of Definition 2.3 are fulfilled with $\delta = 1$ for $n \geq 2$ and every $\delta < 1$ for $n = 1$. Hence, K_n is a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel.

We turn now to the verification of the weak compactness condition. For every compact interval I with center $c(I)$, we introduce the kernel

$$K_n^I(x,t) = |I| K_n(|I|x + c(I), |I|t + c(I)),$$

and note that

(9)

$$|K_n^I(x,t)| \leq \frac{1}{|x-t|} F_{3,n}\left(\max\left(\left|\log_2(|I||x-t|)\right|, \left||I|(x+t) + 2c(I)\right|\right)\right),$$

where

$$F_{3,n}(M) = \sup_{I_{x,t} \in \mathcal{I}_M^c} \left| \frac{G_n(x,t)}{(x-t)^n} \right|.$$

As before it is clear that $F_{3,n}$ is a decreasing function with $\|F_{3,n}\|_\infty \lesssim 2^n \|A'\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}^n$ and $\lim_{M\to\infty} F_{3,n}(M) = 0$. For $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, we write $\phi_I(x) = |I|^{-1/2} \phi\left(\frac{x - c(I)}{|I|}\right)$. Given $\phi, \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, we have by the anti-symmetry of K_n that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle T_n \varphi_I, \phi_I \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K_n(x,t)(\phi_I(x)\varphi_I(t) - \phi_I(t)\varphi_I(x))\, dx\, dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K_n^I(x,t)(\phi(x)\varphi(t) - \phi(t)\varphi(x))\, dx\, dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|K_n^I(x,t)| \lesssim 2^n |x-t|^{-1}$ uniformly in I, there exists for each pair (φ,ϕ) a constant $C_{\varphi,\phi}$ depending only on a finite number of Schwarz class seminorms, with the following property: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $M \geq 1$, independent of φ and ϕ, such that

$$\left| \int_{\{|x-t|>M\} \cup \{|x-t|<\frac{1}{M}\} \cup \{|x+t|>M\}} K_n^I(x,t)(\phi(x)\varphi(t) - \phi(t)\varphi(x))\, dx\, dt \right| \leq 2^n C_{\varphi,\phi} \varepsilon.$$

To see this, simply note that

$$\frac{\phi(x)\varphi(t) - \phi(t)\varphi(x)}{x - t} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

is a Schwarz function of two variables. Furthermore, in view of (9) we have

$$\left| \int\limits_{\{\frac{1}{M}<|x-t|<M\}\cap\{|x+t|<M\}} K_n^I(x,t)(\phi(x)\varphi(t)-\phi(t)\varphi(x))\,dx\,dt \right| \tag{10}$$
$$\leq C_n C'_{\varphi,\phi} F_{3,n}\left(\max\left(\log_2(\frac{|I|}{M}), -\log_2(|I|M), \frac{\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{D}_1)}{M}\right)\right),$$

for some constants C_n and $C'_{\varphi,\phi}$, depending only on n and a finite number of seminorms of φ and ϕ, respectively. Note in particular that $|x+t|<M$ and $|c(I)|>M|I|$ imply that

$$||I|(x+t)+2c(I)|>|c(I)|\gtrsim \frac{\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{D}_1)-1}{M}.$$

Together with the trivial facts that $|I||x-t|>|I|/M$ and $|I||x-t|<|I|M$ when (x,t) lies in the domain of integration of (10), and that $\frac{\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{D}_1)}{M}\leq 2$ when $|c(I)|\leq M|I|$, we obtain the desired estimate in (10) for an appropriate C_n. We conclude that T_n satisfies the weak compactness condition. For future reference we also record the implied bound on the weak boundedness constant of T_n present in the above considerations. Namely

$$|\langle T_n\varphi_I,\phi_I\rangle|\lesssim 2^n\|A'\|^n_{\mathrm{BMO}}C'_{\varphi,\phi}.$$

Finally, we shall show that $T_n(1)$ belongs to CMO by evaluating it inductively in a principal value sense. The justifications for these computations are analogous to those that appear in considerations of Cauchy type operators in connection with the classical $T(1)$ theory, see for example Christ [1].

For x with $|x|<r<R$ and $\varepsilon>0$, integrate by parts to obtain that

$$\int\limits_{\substack{|t|<R\\|t-x|>\varepsilon}} K_n(x,t)\,dt = \frac{1}{n}\left[\frac{G_n(x,t)}{(x-t)^n}\right]_{t=-R}^{t=R} - \frac{1}{n}\left[\frac{G_n(x,t)}{(x-t)^n}\right]_{t=x-\varepsilon}^{t=x+\varepsilon} +$$
$$\int\limits_{\substack{|t|<R\\|t-x|>\varepsilon}} \frac{G_{n-1}(x,t)}{(x-t)^n}(A'(t)+\frac{1}{2}A'(x-\frac{1}{4}(x-t))-\frac{3}{2}A'(x-\frac{3}{4}(x-t)))\,dt,$$

with the understanding that $G_0\equiv 1$. Splitting the latter integral into three parts according to its summands and making the linear changes of variables $x-t=4(x-z)$ and $x-t=\frac{4}{3}(x-w)$ in the last two terms we find that

$$\int_{\substack{|t|<R \\ |t-x|>\varepsilon}} K_n(x,t)\,dt = \frac{1}{n}\left[\frac{G_n(x,t)}{(x-t)^n}\right]_{t=-R}^{t=R} - \frac{1}{n}\left[\frac{G_n(x,t)}{(x-t)^n}\right]_{t=x-\varepsilon}^{t=x+\varepsilon} \tag{11}$$

$$+\int_{\substack{|t|<R \\ |t-x|>\varepsilon}} \frac{G_{n-1}(x,t)}{(x-t)^n}A'(t)\,dt + \frac{2}{4^n}\int_{\substack{|x-4(x-z)|<R \\ |z-x|>\varepsilon/4}} \frac{G_{n-1}(x,x-4(x-z))}{(x-z)^n}A'(z)\,dz$$

$$-2\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \int_{\substack{|x-\frac{4}{3}(x-w)|<R \\ |w-x|>3\varepsilon/4}} \frac{G_{n-1}(x,x-\frac{4}{3}(x-w))}{(x-w)^n}A'(w)\,dw$$

Since $A' \in \mathrm{CMO}$ it is clear that the first two terms tend to zero, uniformly for $|x| < r$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $R \to \infty$.

Suppose now that $n = 1$. Seeing as r is arbitrary, we then find in the limit that

$$T_1(1) = H(A') + \frac{1}{2}H(A') - \frac{3}{2}H(A') = 0.$$

where H denotes the usual Hilbert transform. Note that the Hilbert transform is bounded as a map $H : \mathrm{CMO} \to \mathrm{CMO}$.

At this point we have verified the compactness of T_1 on L^p, $1 < p < \infty$, and as a map $T_1 : L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}} \to \mathrm{CMO}$. We now proceed with the inductive step to prove the same for T_n, $n \geq 2$. In this case passing to the limit in (11) gives

$$T_n(1) = T_{n-1}(A') + \frac{2}{4^n}\widetilde{T}_{n-1}(A') - 2\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \widehat{T}_{n-1}(A'), \tag{12}$$

where $\widetilde{T}_{n-1}$ and $\widehat{T}_{n-1}$ are the operators associated to the kernels

$$\widetilde{K}_{n-1}(x,z) = \frac{G_{n-1}(x,x-4(x-z))}{(x-z)^n},$$
$$\widehat{K}_{n-1}(x,w) = \frac{G_{n-1}(x,x-\frac{4}{3}(x-w))}{(x-w)^n}.$$

These kernels are very similar in character to K_{n-1}, and all computations performed up to this point can be repeated with minor modifications for them. In particular, $\widetilde{K}_{n-1}$ and $\widehat{K}_{n-1}$ are compact Calderón-Zygmund kernels, $\widetilde{T}_{n-1}$ and $\widehat{T}_{n-1}$ satisfy the weak compactness condition, $\widetilde{T}_1(1) = \widehat{T}_1(1) = 0$ and for $n \geq 2$, both $\widetilde{T}_n(1)$ and $\widehat{T}_n(1)$ are linear combinations of $T_{n-1}(A')$, $\widetilde{T}_{n-1}(A')$ and $\widehat{T}_{n-1}(A')$ with coefficients exponential in n.

Using these results and the fact that $A' \in L^\infty \cap \mathrm{CMO}$, we obtain by induction that $T_n : L^p \to L^p$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $T_n : L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}} \to \mathrm{CMO}$ are compact maps for $n \geq 1$. Furthermore, by inspecting the constants in the above calculations and appealing to classical $T(1)$ theory [1], we obtain bounds on the corresponding operator norms; there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|T_n\|_{L^p\to L^p} \leq C^n \|A'\|_\infty^n, \quad \|T_n\|_{L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}\to \mathrm{CMO}} \leq C^n \|A'\|_\infty^n.$$

We conclude that $T_\Gamma - H_\Gamma : L^p(\Gamma) \to L^p(\Gamma)$ is compact when $\|A'\|_\infty < 2/C$, hence finishing the proof of Proposition 3.1. ☐

4. Necessity of the hypotheses

We prove in this section the necessity of the two conditions of Theorem 2.19: the weak compactness condition and the membership of $T(1)$ and $T^*(1)$ in $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$. We notice that, in analogy with the classical theory, the necessity of the weak compactness condition holds for any compact operator on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ whose adjoint also defines a bounded operator on L^p. Meanwhile, the necessity of the second hypothesis will only be shown for operators associated with compact Calderón-Zygmund kernels, for which we will be able to give meaning to $T(1)$ and $T^*(1)$. The sufficiency of both conditions will be proven in the forthcoming Sections 5, 6 and 7.

4.1. **Weak compactness condition.**

We prove first that every linear operator compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ and bounded on $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, satisfies the weak compactness condition.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Let T be a bounded operator on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ such that T^* also defines a bounded operator on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. Then, for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$, T satisfies that for all intervals $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and bump functions ϕ_I, φ_I L^2-adapted to I with constant $C > 0$ and order N, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| &\leq C_{p,T} C\Big(1 + \frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{-\alpha}\Big(1 + \frac{2^{-M}}{|I|}\Big)^{-\alpha}\Big(1 + \frac{\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})}{M}\Big)^{-N} \\ &+ C\|P_M^\perp \circ T\| \end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha = |1/2 - 1/p| + 1/2$.

Remark 4.2. *We have that $C_{p,T} \lesssim \max(\|T\|_{p\to p}, \|T^*\|_{p\to p})C_p$, where C_p is the constant of boundedness on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ of the lagom projection operator P_M (which in turn depends on the boundedness constant on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ of the square function).*

Corollary 4.3. *Let T to be a compact operator on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ such that T^* is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. Then, T satisfies the weak compactness condition.*

Notice that, in this case, we can take

$$L(x) = (1 + x)^{-\alpha} \qquad S(x) = (1 + x^{-1})^{-\alpha} \qquad D(x) = (1 + x)^{-1}$$

Proof. We start with the estimate

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| \leq |\langle (P_M \circ T)(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| + |\langle (T - P_M \circ T)(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle|$$

which second term can be quickly bounded by

$$\|T - P_M \circ T\| \|\phi_I\|_p \|\varphi_I\|_{p'} \leq C\|P_M^{\perp} \circ T\| |I|^{1/p-1/2} |I|^{1/p'-1/2} = C\|P_M^{\perp} \circ T\|$$

The control of the first term requires much more work. If $I \in \mathcal{D}_{M+2}$, by boundedness of T and P_M on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, we can bound it by

$$|\langle (P_M \circ T)(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| \leq C_p\|T\| \|\phi_I\|_p \|\varphi_I\|_{p'} \leq C_p C\|T\|$$

This estimate is compatible with the statement since $2^{-(M+2)} \leq |I| \leq 2^{(M+2)}$ and $\operatorname{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) < M + 2$.

If $I \notin \mathcal{D}_{M+2}$, we denote by $(\psi_J)_{J\in\mathcal{D}}$ the wavelet basis defining P_M. Then, the first term can be bounded by

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \leq \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M} |\langle T(\phi_I), \psi_J\rangle| |\langle \varphi_I, \psi_J\rangle| \tag{13}$$

Now, by boundedness of T and T^*, we bound the first factor in the sum by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle T(\phi_I), \psi_J\rangle| &\leq \min(\|T\| \|\phi_I\|_p \|\psi_J\|_{p'}, \|T^*\| \|\phi_I\|_{p'} \|\psi_J\|_p) \\
&\leq C \max(\|T\|, \|T^*\|) \min(|I|^{1/p-1/2}|J|^{1/p'-1/2}, |I|^{1/p'-1/2}|J|^{1/p-1/2}) \\
&\lesssim \min\Big(\big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\big)^{1/p-1/2}, \big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\big)^{1/2-1/p} \Big) \\
&= \Big(\frac{\min(|I|, |J|)}{\max(|I|, |J|)}\Big)^{|1/2-1/p|}
\end{aligned}$$

We denote $\theta_p = |1/2 - 1/p|$.

To bound the second factor in the sum in (13) we consider the three following cases: 1) $|I| > 2^{M+2}$, 2) $|I| < 2^{-(M+2)}$ and 3) $2^{-(M+2)} < |I| < 2^{M+2}$ with $\operatorname{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) > M + 2$.

1) Since $|I| > 2^M \geq |J|$, by the mean zero of ψ_J we know from Lemma 2.8 that

$$|\langle \varphi_I, \psi_J\rangle| \leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{3/2} (1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|)^{-N}$$

which leads to the following bound in (13)

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \lesssim \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M} \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2} (1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|)^{-N} \tag{14}$$

Now, since $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$ implies $J \subset \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}$ with $2^{-M} \leq |J| \leq 2^M$, we can parametrize these intervals by their size: $|J| = 2^{-k}2^M$ with $0 \leq k \leq 2M$, in such a way that for every fixed k there are $M2^k$ intervals. Moreover, for all $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$, the value of $1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|$ can be bounded from below to obtain

$$1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \gtrsim 1 + M^{-1} \operatorname{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})$$

a) when $\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) > 2$, we have $I \cap \mathbb{B}_{M2^M} = \emptyset$ and so $\operatorname{dist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \geq \operatorname{dist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}|c(I)-c(J)| &\geq |I|/2+\operatorname{dist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{M2^M})\\ &\geq |I|/4+2^M+\operatorname{dist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})\\ \geq 1/4(|I|+2^M&+\operatorname{dist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})) \geq 1/4\operatorname{diam}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)| &\geq 1+1/4|I|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})\\ &\geq 1/4(1+\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))\end{aligned}$$

b) when $\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{diam}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}) &\leq \operatorname{diam}(I,\mathbb{B}_{M2^M})\\ = \operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{M2^M})&\max(|I|,M2^M) \leq 2M\max(|I|,2^M)\end{aligned}$$

and so, $\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \leq 2M$. With this,

$$1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)| \geq 1 \geq 1/3(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))$$

Finally, we also notice that for every fixed k and for every $n \geq 4^{-1}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))$ there are less than $\frac{|I|}{|J|}=\frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M}$ and less than 2^kM intervals $J\in\mathcal{D}_M$ such that $n\leq 1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|<n+1$.

As a result, we can parametrize and bound the sum in (14) in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle T(\phi_I),P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| &\lesssim \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M}\sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}_M\\|J|=2^{-k}2^M}}\Big(\frac{2^{-k}2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2}(1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|)^{-N}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2}\sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M}2^{-k(\theta_p+3/2)}\min(\frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M},2^kM)\sum_{n\geq\frac14(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))}n^{-N}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2}\min(\frac{|I|}{2^M},M)(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}\sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M}2^{-k(\theta_p+1/2)}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2}\frac{|I|}{2^M}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}\end{aligned}$$

Then, we finally obtain

$$|\langle T(\phi_I),P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N} \tag{15}$$

2) Since $|I|<2^{-M}\leq|J|$, we have by Lemma 2.8

$$|\langle\varphi_I,\psi_J\rangle| \leq C\Big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\Big)^{1/2}(1+|J|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|)^{-N}$$

which leads to a bound of (13) by

$$|\langle T(\phi_I),P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \lesssim \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M}\Big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+|J|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|)^{-N} \tag{16}$$

As before, we parametrize the intervals $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$ by their size $|J| = 2^{-k}2^M$ with $0 \leq k \leq 2M$, all of them satisfying $J \subset \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}$. We work now to bound $1 + |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|$ from above and below. Since $I \notin \mathcal{D}_{M+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq |c(I) - c(J)| \leq |c(I)| + |c(J)|\\ \leq |c(I)| + M2^M \leq 2(|I|/2 + |c(I)| + M2^{M-1}) \leq 2\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M})\end{aligned}$$

and so, for every k

$$2^k 2^{-M}\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \leq 2^{k+1}2^{-M}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M})$$

Moreover, since $|I| \leq |J|$, for fixed k, the $M2^k$ intervals $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$ can be parametrized in such a way that $1 + |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| = j$ with all j pairwise different and such that

$$1 + 2^k 2^{-M}\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq j \leq 1 + 2^k M\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \tag{17}$$

We now separate into two subcases in a similar way as we did before but by using the distance instead of the relative distance: $\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) > 2|\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}|$ and $\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 2|\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}|$. In the first instance we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \leq \mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq |I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) + M2^M\\ \leq 2M2^M + \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 2\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M})\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (17),

$$\begin{aligned}j \geq 1 + 2^k 2^{-M}\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \geq 1 + 2^{k-1}2^{-M}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})\\ \geq 2^{k-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \geq 2^{k-2}(1 + \,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we parametrize and bound the sum in (16) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle T(\phi_I), P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| &\lesssim \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M\\ |J| = 2^{-k}2^M}} \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+|J|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|)^{-N}\\ &\leq \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)} \sum_{j\geq 2^{k-2}(1+\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))} j^{-N}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} 2^{-k(N-(\theta_p+1/2))}(1 + \,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1 + \,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}\\ &= \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-M}}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} 2^{-2M(\theta_p+1/2)}(1 + \,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}\end{aligned}$$

which is better than the stated bound.

On the other hand, when $\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 2|\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}|$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq |I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) + M2^M\\ \leq 2M2^M + \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 4M2^M\end{aligned}$$

and so $|\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}| \leq \mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 4|\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}|$, that is, $1 \leq \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 4$. Then, by (17), we have $1 \leq j \leq 1 + 2^{k+2}M$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) &= |\mathbb{B}_{2^M}|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})\\ &\leq M|\mathbb{B}_{M2^M}|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \leq 4M\end{aligned}$$

and so, $1 + M^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \leq 5$.

Thereby, we can now bound the sum in (16) in the following way:

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \lesssim \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M\\ |J| = 2^{-k}2^M}} \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+|J|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|)^{-N}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)} \sum_{1\leq j\leq 1+2^{k+2}M} j^{-N}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} \sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)} \lesssim \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} 2^{2M(\theta_p+1/2)}\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-M}}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1 + M^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}\end{aligned}$$

In both subcases we obtain

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \lesssim \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-M}}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1 + M^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N} \tag{18}$$

3) To deal with case $2^{-(M+2)} < |I| < 2^{M+2}$ and $\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) > M + 2$, we will mix the techniques of the two previous cases: for those $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$ such that $|J| \leq |I|$ we will reason as we did to deduce (15), while for those $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$ such that $|J| \geq |I|$ we will reason in a similar way as we did to obtain (18).

In the subcase $|I| \geq |J|$, we first prove the bound

$$1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \gtrsim 1 + \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \tag{19}$$

We start by checking that $\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) > M + 2$ implies that $I \cap \mathbb{B}_{M2^M} = \emptyset$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}|I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) + 2^{M+2} &\geq \mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}})\\ &= \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}})2^{M+2} > (M + 2)2^{M+2}\end{aligned}$$

and $|I| \leq 2^{M+2}$, we have $\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) > M2^{M+2}$. Therefore, we have $I \cap \mathbb{B}_{M2^{M+2}} = \emptyset$.

This, together with $J \subset \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}$, implies

$$|c(I) - c(J)| \geq \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{M2^M}) \geq \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) - \mathrm{dist}(\mathbb{B}_{2^M}, \mathbb{B}^c_{M2^M})$$

that is,

$$|c(I) - c(J)| \geq \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) - 2^M(M - 1) \tag{20}$$

Moreover, since $\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) \leq \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})$, we have

$$(M + 2)2^{M+2} \leq \mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}})$$

$$\leq |I| + \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M+2}}) + 2^{M+2} \leq \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) + 2^{M+3}$$

and so,

$$M2^M \leq 1/4\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \tag{21}$$

With this and (20), we get

$$|c(I) - c(J)| \geq 3/4\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})$$

Furthermore, since (21) implies $|I| \leq 2^{M+2} \leq M^{-1}\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) &\leq \mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) + |I| + 2^M\\ &\leq (1 + 2M^{-1})\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \leq 3\mathrm{dist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$|c(I) - c(J)| \geq 1/4\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})$$

Finally then,

$$1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \geq 1/4(1 + |I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))$$

$$\geq 1/4(1 + \max(|I|, 2^M)^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M})) = 1/4(1 + \ \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))$$

as we wanted.

Now, similar as before, we notice that for every fixed k and for every $n \geq 4^{-1}(1 + \ \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))$ there are at most $|I|/|J| = \frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M}$ intervals $J \in \mathcal{D}_M$ such that $n \leq 1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| < n + 1$. With this, the part under consideration of the sum in (14) can be parametrized and estimated in the following way:

$$\sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ |J| = 2^{-k}2^M \leq |I|}} \Big(\frac{2^{-k}2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2}(1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|)^{-N}$$

$$\lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+3/2} \sum_{\max(0,M+\log|I|^{-1})\leq k\leq 2M} 2^{-k(\theta_p+3/2)}\frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M} \sum_{n\geq\frac{1}{4}(1+\ \mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))} n^{-N}$$

$$\leq \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} \sum_{\max(0,M+\log|I|^{-1})\leq k} 2^{-k(\theta_p+1/2)}(1 + \ \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

$$\lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1 + \ \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N} \min\Big(\Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}, 1\Big)$$

$$\lesssim (1 + \ \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

For the second subcase, $|I| \leq |J| \leq 2^M$, we parametrize and bound the relevant subsum of (16) as

$$\sum_{0\leq k\leq 2M} \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ |J| = 2^{-k}2^M \geq |I|}} \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-k}2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1 + |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|)^{-N}$$

$$= \Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2} \sum_{0\le k\le 2M} \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}_M\\ |J|=2^{-k}2^M\ge|I|}} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)}(1+|J|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|)^{-N} \tag{22}$$

We now decompose the sums in the same way we did before:

$$\sum_{0\le k\le \min(2M, M+\log|I|^{-1})} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)}\Big(\sum_{j\ge 2^{k-2}(1+\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))} j^{-N} + \sum_{1\le j\le 1+2^{k+2}M} j^{-N}\Big)$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{0\le k\le M+\log|I|^{-1}} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)}(2^{-Nk}(1+\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}+(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N})$$

$$\lesssim \Big(\sum_{0\le k\le M+\log|I|^{-1}} 2^{-k(N-(\theta_p+1/2))}+\sum_{0\le k\le M+\log|I|^{-1}} 2^{k(\theta_p+1/2)}\Big)(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

$$\lesssim (1+\Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2})(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

$$\lesssim \Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N} \tag{23}$$

since $|I|\le 2^M$. Notice here that the splitting of the sum into two parts is merely a notational device to express the division into two further sub-subcases along the lines of the subcases considered in 2): $|I|<2^{-(M+2)}$. In particular, note that in the considerations from which the sum $\sum_{1\le j\le 1+2^{k+2}M} j^{-N}$ arises, we showed that $\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})/M\lesssim 1$ and therefore,

$$\sum_{1\le j\le 1+2^{k+2}M} j^{-N}\lesssim 1\lesssim (1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

Then, with (23), we can bound (22) by

$$\Big(\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}\Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

$$=(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

Putting everything together, we get in the third case that

$$|\langle T(\phi_I),P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle|\lesssim (1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N} \tag{24}$$

Finally, with (15), (18), (24) and using $\min(a,b)\approx 1/(a^{-1}+b^{-1})$, we have

$$|\langle T(\phi_I),P_M(\varphi_I)\rangle| \tag{25}$$

$$\lesssim \min(1,\Big(\frac{2^M}{|I|}\Big))^{\theta_p+1/2}\min(1,\Big(\frac{|I|}{2^{-M}}\Big))^{\theta_p+1/2}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

$$\lesssim \Big(1+\frac{|I|}{2^M}\Big)^{-(\theta_p+1/2)}\Big(1+\frac{2^{-M}}{|I|}\Big)^{-(\theta_p+1/2)}(1+M^{-1}\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}))^{-N}$$

finishing the proof.

□

4.2. **Interlude on compact Calderón-Zygmund kernels.** Before proving the necessity of the second hypothesis, we will devote some time to justify the assumption of some extra properties of the compact Calderón-Zygmund kernels and the admissible functions appearing in their definition.

We will start by assuming that the admissible functions satisfy that L and D are monotone non-increasing while S is monotone non-decreasing. This is possible because if L, S and D are admissible and as in Definition 2.3, then the functions

$$L_1(x) = \sup_{y\in[x,\infty)} L(y) \qquad S_1(x) = \sup_{y\in[0,x]} S(y) \qquad D_1(x) = \sup_{y\in[x,\infty)} D(y)$$

are admissible, give bounds for the kernel as in Definition 2.3 and satisfy the monotonicity requirements.

More importantly, in all forthcoming proofs, we will not be using the smoothness hypothesis of the kernel as it is stated in Definition 2.3. Instead, we will adopt the following alternative formulation:

Definition 4.4. *Let Δ be the diagonal of $\mathbb{R}^2$. A function $K : (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta) \to \mathbb{C}$ is a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel if $\lim\limits_{|x-t|\to\infty} K(x,t) = 0$ and there exists a $0 < \delta' < 1$ and admissible functions L_1, S_1, D_1 such that*

$$|K(x,t) - K(x',t')| \leq C\frac{(|x-x'|+|t-t'|)^{\delta'}}{|x-t|^{1+\delta'}} \\ L_1(|x-t|)S_1(|x-x'|+|t-t'|)D_1\Big(1+\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}\Big) \tag{26}$$

whenever $2(|x-x'|+|t-t'|) < |x-t|$.

We claim that the condition in Definition 2.3 implies this new condition (26), with any $\delta' < \delta$. To see this, pick $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$, let $\delta' = \delta - \varepsilon$, and

$$F(x,t,x',t') = \frac{(|x-x'|+|t-t'|)^{\varepsilon}}{|x-t|^{\varepsilon}} L(|x-t|)S(|x-t|)D(|x+t|),$$

defined for tuples (x,t,x',t') such that $2(|x-x'|+|t-t'|) < |x-t|$. Then, by Definition 2.3,

$$|K(x,t) - K(x',t')| \leq C\frac{(|x-x'|+|t-t'|)^{\delta'}}{|x-t|^{1+\delta'}} F(x,t,x',t')$$

with F bounded and such that $\lim_{|x-t|\to\infty} F = 0$.

We prove now that also $\lim_{|x-x'|+|t-t'|\to 0} F = 0$. Suppose there exists a sequence (x_n, t_n, x_n', t_n') such that $2(|x_n - x_n'| + |t_n - t_n'|) < |x_n - t_n|$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} |x_n - x_n'| + |t_n - t_n'| = 0$, but $\inf_n F(x_n, t_n, x_n', t_n') > 0$.

If there would exist a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|x_n - x'_n| + |t_n - t'_n| \geq C|x_n - t_n|$$

then, by monotonicity of S, we would have

$$S(|x_n - t_n|) \leq S(C^{-1}(|x_n - x_{n'}| + |t_n - t_{n'}|))$$

The upper bound tends to zero and so, also $F(x_n, t_n, x_{n'}, t_n)$ would tend to zero, giving a contradiction.

Hence

$$\varliminf_n \frac{|x_n - x'_n| + |t_n - t'_n|}{|x_n - t_n|} = 0,$$

This immediately gives $\varliminf_n F(x_n, t_n, x'_n, t'_n) = 0$, also a contradiction.

It is also clear that $\lim_{\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}\to\infty} F = 0$, in view of the inequality $\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|} \leq |x+t|$ and the monotonicity of D.

Finally, we define for $y \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(y) &= \sup_{|x-t|\geq y} F(x,t,x',t')^{1/3}, \\ S_1(y) &= \sup_{|x-x'|+|t-t'|\leq y} F(x,t,x',t')^{1/3}, \\ D_1(y) &= \sup_{1+\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}\geq y} F(x,t,x',t')^{1/3}, \end{aligned}$$

This way, L_1, S_1 and D_1 constitute a set of admissible functions and the corresponding smoothness condition holds since

$$L_1(|x-t|)S_1(|x-x'|+|t-t'|)D_1\Big(1+\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}\Big) \geq F(x,t,x',t')$$

Therefore, from now on we will assume that a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel is associated with a δ' (which we will denote simply δ) and admissible, monotone functions L_1, S_1 and D_1 (denoted L, S and D) satisfying the inequality (26).

One reason for this change of notation is that, since

$$|x| \leq |x| + |t| \approx |x-t| + |x+t| \leq 1 + |x-t| + |x+t|$$

we have

$$1 + \frac{|x|}{1+|x-t|} \leq 2\Big(1+\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}\Big)$$

and by the monotonicity of D_1,

$$D_1\Big(1+\frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}\Big) \leq D_1\Big(2^{-1}\Big(1+\frac{|x|}{1+|x-t|}\Big)\Big).$$

This fact will be crucially used in our proofs.

Finally, we notice that, under the condition $2(|x-x'|+|t-t'|) < |x-t|$,

$$1 + \frac{\min(|x+t|, |x'+t'|)}{1+|x-t|} \approx 1 + \frac{|x+t|}{1+|x-t|}.$$

4.3. **Necessity of $T(1) \in$ CMO.** Now, in order to prove that the second condition is necessary, we first need to give a rigorous definition of $T(1)$. Actually, Lemma 4.5 will allow us to define $T(b)$ for every bounded smooth function b, as a functional in the dual of the space of smooth functions with compact support and mean zero.

Once this is done, the hypothesis that $T(1) \in \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ means that the inequality

$$|\langle T(1), f\rangle| \leq C\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

holds for a dense subspace of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, we will verify the estimate for all smooth functions f with compact support and mean zero, which are dense in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, the hypothesis $T(1) \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ means that

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} |\langle P_M^{\perp}(T(1)), f\rangle| = 0$$

holds uniformly in a dense subset of the unit ball of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. The necessity of $T(1) \in$ CMO when T is a compact operator will be proven in Proposition 4.8.

For all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda > 0$, $p > 0$, we define the translation operator as $\mathcal{T}_a(f)(x) = f(x-a)$ and the dilation operators as $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(f)(x) = f(x/\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{D}_\lambda^p(f)(x) = \lambda^{-1/p} f(x/\lambda)$. Let also $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ be a smooth cut-off function such that $\Phi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$, $0 < \Phi(x) < 1$ for $1 < |x| < 2$ and $\Phi(x) = 0$ for $|x| > 2$.

In order to give meaning to $T(1)$ (and also to $T^*(1)$), we use the following technical lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *Let T be a linear operator associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel K with parameter $\delta > 0$ (as in Section 4.2). Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and let $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ have compact support in I and mean zero. Then, the limit*

$$\mathcal{L}(f) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle T(\mathcal{T}_a \mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle$$

exists and it is independent of the translation parameter $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and the cut-off function Φ.

Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^k \geq 1 + |I|^{-1}|a - c(I)|$, we have the error bound

$$|\mathcal{L}(f) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_a \mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle| \leq C 2^{-\delta k}(1 + |I|^{-1}|a - c(I)|)^{\delta}$$

$$\sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\delta k'} L_K(2^{k'+k}|I|) S_K(2^{k'+k}|I|) D_K(1 + (1 + 2^{k'+k}|I|)^{-1}|a|) \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

where the constant C depends only on Φ and T.

Remark 4.6. *Notice that when $|a| \geq |c(I)|$ we have the bound*

$$|\mathcal{L}(f) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_a \mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle| \leq C 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\delta k'} F_K(2^{k'+k} I) \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

This is due to the fact that when $|a| \geq |c(I)|$ *we have*

$$1 + (1 + 2^j|I|)^{-1}|a| \geq 1 + (1 + 2^j|I|)^{-1}|c(I)|$$

$$\geq (1 + 2^j|I|)^{-1}(1 + 2^j|I| + |c(I)|) \geq 1/2 \max(2^j|I|, 1)^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(2^jI \cup \mathbb{B})$$

$$= 1/2\, \mathrm{rdist}(2^jI, \mathbb{B})$$

and, since D *is non-increasing*

$$L(2^j|I|)S(2^j|I|)D(1 + (1 + 2^j|I|)^{-1}|a|)$$

$$\lesssim L(2^j|I|)S(2^k|I|)D(\,\mathrm{rdist}(2^jI, \mathbb{B})) = F_K(2^jI)$$

Notice that, by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, the function

$$\tilde{F}(2^kI) = \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\delta k'} F_K(2^{k'+k}I)$$

has the same limit behavior as F, that is,

$$\lim_{\substack{M \to \infty \\ 2^kI \in \mathcal{D}_M^c}} \tilde{F}(2^kI) = 0$$

and we can furthermore assume analogous monotonicity properties. Then, with some abuse of notation to maintain its symmetry, we will denote $\tilde{F}(2^kI)$ again by $F(2^kI)$.

With this convention the inequality we will frequently use in later proofs is written as

$$|\mathcal{L}(f) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_a\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle| \leq C2^{-k\delta}F_K(2^kI)\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \tag{27}$$

Proof. For the proof, we will drop the subindex K in the notation of F and the admissible functions.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^k \geq 1+|I|^{-1}|a-c(I)|)$, we introduce the smooth cut-off $\Psi_k = \mathcal{T}_aD_{2^{k+2}|I|}\Phi - \mathcal{T}_aD_{2^{k+1}|I|}\Phi$. We aim to estimate $|\langle T(\Psi_k), f\rangle|$.

In view of the supports of Ψ_k and f, we may restrict ourselves to t and x satisfying $2^{k+1}|I| < |t-a| < 2^{k+3}|I|$ and $|x - c(I)| \leq |I|/2$. Then,

$$|x - a| \leq |x - c(I)| + |c(I) - a| \leq |I|/2 + |c(I) - a|$$

$$\leq |I|(1 + |I|^{-1}|c(I) - a|) < |I|2^k < 2^{-1}|t - a|$$

Therefore, the supports of Ψ_k and f are disjoint and so, we can use the kernel representation

$$\langle T(\Psi_k), f\rangle = \int \Psi_k(t)f(x)K(x,t)\,dtdx$$

$$= \int \Psi_k(t)f(x)(K(x,t) - K(a,t))\,dtdx$$

where the second equality is due to the zero mean of f.

Since $2|x-a| < |t-a|$, we can use the definition of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel to obtain

$$|\langle T(\Psi_k), f\rangle| \leq \int |\Psi_k(t)||f(x)|\frac{|x-a|^\delta}{|t-a|^{1+\delta}}$$
$$L(|t-a|)S(|x-a|)D(1+(1+|t-a|)^{-1}|a|)\, dtdx$$

Notice that we are using the conventions of Section 4.2.

As we have seen, we may restrict the domain of integration to $|x-c(I)| < |I|/2$ and $2^{k+1}|I| < |t-a| < 2^{k+3}|I|$. Moreover, as we saw, $|x-a| \leq |I| + |a-c(I)|$. Then, by the monotonicity properties of L, S and D, we have

$$|\langle T(\Psi_k), f\rangle| \leq CL(2^{k+3}|I|)S(2^{k+1}|I|)D(1+(1+2^{k+3}|I|)^{-1}|a|)$$
$$\int_{|x-c(I)|<|I|/2}\int_{|t-a|<2^{k+3}|I|} |f(x)|\frac{|I|^\delta(1+|I|^{-1}|a-c(I)|)^\delta}{2^{k(1+\delta)}|I|^{(1+\delta)}}\, dtdx$$
$$\leq C2^{-k\delta}(1+|I|^{-1}|a-c(I)|)^\delta$$
$$L(2^k|I|)S(2^k|I|)D(1+(1+2^k|I|)^{-1}|a|)\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

Notice that we have used that $1+(1+2^{k+3}|I|)^{-1}|a| > 2^{-3}(1+(1+2^k|I|)^{-1}|a|)$ and Remark 2.2 to hide all constants in the argument of admissible functions.

Now, the trivial bound

$$|\langle T(\Psi_k), f\rangle| \leq C2^{-k\delta}(1+|I|^{-1}|a-c(I)|)^\delta\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

proves that the sequence $(\langle T(\mathcal{T}_a D_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle)_{k>0}$ is Cauchy and thus, the existence of the limit, which we will momentarily denote by $\mathcal{L}_a(f)$.

Finally, the explicit rate of convergence stated in the lemma follows by summing a geometric series. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\mathcal{L}_a(f)-\langle T(\mathcal{T}_a\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle| \leq \lim_{m\to\infty}|\mathcal{L}_a(f)-\langle T(\mathcal{T}_a\mathcal{D}_{2^m|I|}\Phi), f\rangle|+\sum_{k'=k}^{\infty}|\langle T(\Psi_{k'}), f\rangle|$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{k'=k}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta}L(2^{k'}|I|)S(2^{k'}|I|)D(1+(1+2^{k'}|I|)^{-1}|a|)\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

as stated.

We show now that $\mathcal{L}_a$ is actually independent of the translation parameter and the cut-off function selected. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\psi_{k,a,b} = \mathcal{T}_a D_{2^k|I|}\Phi - \mathcal{T}_b D_{2^k|I|}\Phi$. Then, for k large enough so that $|a-b| < 2^k|I|$ we have that the support of $\psi_{k,a,b}$ is contained in $(2^{k-1}+1)|I| < |t-(a+b)/2| \leq (2^{k+1}+1/2)|I|$. Therefore, we can repeat previous reasoning to show that also $|\langle T(\psi_{k,a,b}), f\rangle| \lesssim 2^{-k\delta}\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$.

This way,

$$|\mathcal{L}_a(f)-\mathcal{L}_b(f)| \leq |\mathcal{L}_a(f)-\langle T(\mathcal{T}_a\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle|$$
$$+|\langle T(\mathcal{T}_a\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_b\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle| + |\mathcal{L}_b(f)-\langle T(\mathcal{T}_b\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle|$$

$$\lesssim 3 \cdot 2^{-k\delta} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

Moreover, a similar argument works to prove that $\mathcal{L}$ is also independent of the chosen cut-off function Φ. This is because if we take two such smooth cut-off functions Φ and $\tilde{\Phi}$, then $\mathcal{T}_a D_{2^k|I|}\Phi - \mathcal{T}_a D_{2^k|I|}\tilde{\Phi}$ has support included in $2^k|I| < |t-a| \leq 2^{k+1}|I|$.

We prove now the necessity of the second condition. We start with a technical lemma whose short proof can be found in [13], yet, for the sake of completeness, we include here a more detailed version.

Lemma 4.7. *Let I be some interval and f be an integrable function supported in I with mean zero. For each dyadic interval J let ϕ_J be a bump function adapted to J with constant $C > 0$ and order N.*

Then, for all dyadic intervals J such that $|I| \leq |J|$, we have

$$|\langle f, \phi_J \rangle| \leq C\|f\|_1 \frac{|I|}{|J|^{3/2}} \Big(1 + \frac{|c(I) - c(J)|}{|J|}\Big)^{-(N-1)}$$

Proof. We first assume that $|c(I) - c(J)| > 2|J|$. Let c be the midpoint between $c(I)$ and $c(J)$. Then, since $|c - c(I)| = 2^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| > |I|$ we have that $c \notin I$. By symmetry we may assume that $\operatorname{supp} f \subset (-\infty, c)$.

Let D denote the operator of differentiation and D^{-1} the antiderivative operator

$$D^{-1}f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} f(y)dy$$

Since for all $0 \leq n \leq N-1$,

$$|(D\phi_J)^{(n)}(x)| = |\phi_J^{(n+1)}(x)| \leq C|I|^{-(1/2+n+1)}(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{-N}$$

we have that $|J|D\phi_J$ is a bump function adapted to J with the same constant as ϕ_J. Moreover, notice that due to the zero mean of f, the support of $D^{-1}f$ is also included in the support of f.

Then, by partial integration, we have

$$|\langle f, \phi_J \rangle| = |J|^{-1} |\langle D^{-1}f, |J|D\phi_J \rangle|$$

$$\leq |J|^{-1}(\|D^{-1}f\|_{L^1(-\infty,c)} \||J|D\phi_J\|_{L^\infty(-\infty,c)} + \|D^{-1}f\|_{L^\infty(c,\infty)} \||J|D\phi_J\|_{L^1(c,\infty)})$$

$$\leq |J|^{-1}\|D^{-1}f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} C|J|^{-1/2}\Big(1 + \frac{|c(I) - c(J)|}{|J|}\Big)^{1-N}$$

Now, from $\|D^{-1}f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq |I|\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ we obtain

$$|\langle f, \phi_J \rangle| \leq C\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \frac{|I|}{|J|^{3/2}} \Big(1 + \frac{|c(I) - c(J)|}{|J|}\Big)^{1-N}$$

When $|c(I) - c(J)| \leq 2|J|$, we use the easier estimate

$$|\langle f, \phi_J \rangle| = |\langle D^{-1}f, D\phi_J \rangle|$$

$$\leq \|D^{-1}f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \|D\phi_J\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq |I|\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \frac{C}{|J|^{3/2}}$$

which is compatible with the statement.

Proposition 4.8. *Let T be a linear operator associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel. If T can be extended to a compact operator on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for $1 < p < \infty$, then $T(1), T^*(1) \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. We will only show the result for $T(1)$, the argument for $T^*(1)$ being analogous.

We start by proving membership in $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$. To do so, we prove that the functional $\mathcal{L}$ defined in Lemma 4.5 is a bounded linear functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Since linearity is trivial, we prove its continuity on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. By standard arguments, it is enough to prove the result for p'-atoms. Moreover, due to density, we can also assume the atoms to be smooth. Then, let f be a smooth atom in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ supported in an interval I with $\|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim |I|^{-1/p}$ and mean zero.

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Psi_k = \mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^{k+1}|I|}\Phi - \mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi$ be as in the proof of Lemma 4.5. This way, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|\mathcal{L}(f)| \leq |\langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{|I|}\Phi), f\rangle| + \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} |\langle T(\Psi_{k'}), f\rangle|$$
$$+|\mathcal{L}(f) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f\rangle|$$

By using boundedness of T on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ we can bound the first term by

$$\|T\| \|\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}D_{|I|}\Phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}\|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C|I|^{1/p}\|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C$$

From the proof of Lemma 4.5, rather than from the result itself, the second term can be bounded by

$$\sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} C2^{-k'\delta}F_K(2^{k'}I)\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} 2^{-k'\delta}|I|^{1/p}\|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C$$

where δ is the parameter of the compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel. Applying the result of Lemma 4.5, we bound the last term by

$$C2^{-k\delta}F_K(2^kI)\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C$$

With the three estimates, we obtain for every atom f the bound

$$|\mathcal{L}(f)| \leq C$$

which proves, as claimed, that $\mathcal{L}$ defines a bounded linear functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Hence, by the H^1-BMO duality, the functional $\mathcal{L}$ is represented by a $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ function which we will denote by $T(1)$, that is, $\mathcal{L}(f) = \langle T(1), f\rangle$.

In order to prove membership in $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$, we need to show that there is a lagom projection operator P_M such that

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \langle P_M^{\perp}(T(1)), f\rangle = 0$$

uniformly for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ in the ball of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with mean zero and support in a dyadic interval I. For this, we consider the projection operator P_M constructed with a wavelet basis $(\psi_J)_{J\in\mathcal{D}}$ of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that every function ψ_J is smooth, L^2-adapted and compactly supported in J. Since

$$P_M(f) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_M} \langle f, \psi_J \rangle \psi_J = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_M} |J|^{1/2} \langle f, \psi_J \rangle |J|^{-1/2} \psi_J$$

is defined by a finite linear combination of 1-atoms $|J|^{-1/2}\psi_J$, we have that $P_M(f) \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, from the equality $f = P_M(f) + P_M^\perp(f)$, we also deduce that $P_M^\perp(f) \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$.

Now, we can prove the desired convergence. For every $0 < \epsilon$, we take $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $2^{-k\delta} < \epsilon$. Then, due to compactness of T, we can take $M > 0$ (depending on T, δ, p, ϵ and I) so that $\|P_M^\perp \circ T\| 2^{k/p} < \epsilon$ and $2^M > |I| > 2^{-M}$, $I \subset \mathbb{B}_{2^M}$.

We first notice that, by the previous discussion of $\mathcal{L}$ and the fact that $P_M^\perp$ is self-adjoint in the L^2-pairing, we have

$$\langle P_M^\perp(T(1)), f \rangle = \langle T(1), P_M^\perp(f) \rangle = \mathcal{L}(P_M^\perp(f))$$

The second and last expressions are meaningful because we already know that $T(1) \in \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ and $P_M^\perp(f) \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$. However, since $P_M^\perp(f)$ lacks compact support, we need to do some extra work.

By the comments after Definition 2.13 of a lagom projection operator, we can write

$$P_M^\perp(f) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c} \langle f, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I$$

in a Schauder basis sense. Then, by linearity and continuity of $\mathcal{L}$ on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(P_M^\perp(f)) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_M^c} \langle f, \psi_J \rangle \mathcal{L}(\psi_J)$$

Since f and ψ_J have compact support, the non-null terms in the sum arise from those intervals J satisfying $J \cap I \neq \emptyset$, that is, either $J \subset I$ or $I \subset J$. For every $J \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$ we have the following cases: if $|J| > 2^M$ then $I \subset J$; if $|J| < 2^{-M}$ then $J \subset I$. Those J such that $\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) > M$ do not appear in the sum. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}(P_M^\perp(f)) = \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M^c \\ J \subset I}} \langle f, \psi_J \rangle \mathcal{L}(\psi_J) + \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M^c \\ I \subset J}} \langle f, \psi_J \rangle \mathcal{L}(\psi_J)$$

$$= \mathcal{L}(f_I) + \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{D}_M^c \\ I \subset J}} \langle f, \psi_J \rangle \mathcal{L}(\psi_J) \tag{28}$$

where $f_I = \mathcal{P}_I(P_M^\perp(f))$, $\mathcal{P}_I$ denoting the classical projection operator. We notice that $f_I \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with support in I and, due to boundedness of the projections, $\|f_I\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^1} = 1$ and $\|f_I\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim |I|^{-1/p}$. For the first term we proceed as we have done before:

$$\mathcal{L}(f_I) = \langle (P_M^\perp \circ T)(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f_I\rangle + (\mathcal{L}(f_I) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), P_M^\perp(f_I)\rangle)$$

Since $P_M^\perp(f_I) = f_I$, the second term in the sum can be dealt with by Lemma 4.5

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathcal{L}(f_I) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi), f_I\rangle| \\ &\le C2^{-k\delta}\|f_I\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \le C2^{-k\delta} < \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the first term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\|P_M^\perp \circ T\|_{p\to p}\|\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^k|I|}\Phi\|_p\|f_I\|_{p'} \\ &\lesssim \|P_M^\perp \circ T\| 2^{k/p}|I|^{1/p}|I|^{-1/p} = \|P_M^\perp \circ T\|2^{k/p} < \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Now, we bound the second term in (28) by a reiteration of a previous argument. We first parametrize those intervals J such that $I \subset J$ by their size, $|J_j| = 2^j|I|$ with $j \ge 0$. Then we write this second term as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j\ge 0}\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle\mathcal{L}(\psi_{J_j}) &= \sum_{j\ge 0}\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle\langle (P_M^\perp \circ T)(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^{k+j}|I|}\Phi), \psi_{J_j}\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{j\ge 0}\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle(\mathcal{L}(\psi_{J_j}) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^{k+j}|I|}\Phi), P_M^\perp(\psi_{J_j})\rangle)\end{aligned}$$

Since $J_j \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$, we have $\psi_{J_j} = P_M^\perp(\psi_{J_j})$ and so, we can rewrite the second term in previous expression as

$$\sum_{j\ge 0}\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle(\mathcal{L}(\psi_{J_j}) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^{k+j}|I|}\Phi), \psi_{J_j}\rangle)$$

Then, by Lemma 4.5, we can bound its modulus by

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j\ge 0}|\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle||\mathcal{L}(\psi_{J_j}) - \langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^{k+j}|I|}\Phi), \psi_{J_j}\rangle| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j\ge 0}\|f\|_1\|\psi_{J_j}\|_\infty 2^{-(k+j)\delta}\|\psi_{J_j}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\le 2^{-k\delta}\|f\|_1\sum_{j\ge 0}|J_j|^{-1/2}2^{-j\delta}|J_j|^{1/2} \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} < \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we bound the modulus of the first term by

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M^c}|\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle|\|P_M^\perp \circ T\|\|\mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{2^{k+j}|I|}\Phi\|_p\|\psi_{J_j}\|_{p'} \\ &\lesssim \|P_M^\perp \circ T\|\sum_{j\ge 0}|\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle|2^{(k+j)/p}|J_j|^{1/p}|J_j|^{-1/2+1/p'} \\ &= \|P_M^\perp \circ T\|2^{k/p}\sum_{j\ge 0}|\langle f, \psi_{J_j}\rangle|2^{j/p}|J_j|^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

Now, we use Lemma 4.7 to bound last expression by

$$\|P_M^\perp \circ T\| 2^{k/p} \sum_{j\geq 0} C\|f\|_1 \frac{|I|}{|J_j|^{3/2}} 2^{j/p} |J_j|^{1/2}$$

$$= C\|P_M^\perp \circ T\| 2^{k/p} \|f\|_1 \sum_{j\geq 0} \frac{|I|}{2^j|I|} 2^{j/p} = C\|P_M^\perp \circ T\| 2^{k/p} \|f\|_1 \sum_{j\geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{j(1-1/p)}}$$

$$\lesssim C\|P_M^\perp \circ T\| 2^{k/p} < C\epsilon$$

5. THE OPERATOR ACTING ON BUMP FUNCTIONS

In this section we study the action of T over bump functions. In particular, we seek good estimates of the dual pair $\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle$ in terms of the space and frequency localization of the bump functions ψ_I, ψ_J.

Before starting, we will state and prove five lemmata about localization properties of bump functions. These results will be frequently used in Proposition 5.7, the main result of this section. Lemma 5.1 will be used to change the interval where a bump function is adapted with appropriate control of its constant. Remark 5.3 and Lemma 5.4 will be used when we apply the weak compactness condition away from the essential support of the bump functions, while Lemma 5.6 will be mostly used when we apply the cancellation condition $T(1) = 0$ and the weak compactness condition close to the essential support of the bump functions. Finally, Lemma 5.5 will be used to obtain extra cancellation conditions for the argument functions.

As before we will use a smooth cut-off function $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\Phi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$, $0 < \Phi(x) < 1$ for $1 < |x| < 2$, and $\Phi(x) = 0$ for $|x| > 2$. Then, $\Phi_I = \mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}_{|I|}\Phi$ will denote an L^∞-normalized function adapted to I such that $\Phi_I = 1$ in $2I$ and $\Phi_I = 0$ in $(4I)^c$. We also recall that for all $\lambda > 0$, λJ denotes the interval with the same center as J and length $\lambda|J|$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let ψ be a bump function adapted to I with constant C and order N. Let $\psi_{in} = \psi \cdot \Phi_{\lambda J}$ for an interval J with $|J| = |I|$. Then, ψ_{in} is adapted to I with constant $C(1 + \lambda^{-1})^N$ and order N.*

Proof. For all $0 \leq n \leq N$,

$$|\psi_{in}^{(n)}(x)| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right) |\psi^{(k)}(x)||\Phi_{\lambda J}^{(n-k)}(x)|$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right) C|I|^{-(1/2+k)}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}|\lambda I|^{-(n-k)}(1+|\lambda I|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^{-N}$$

$$\leq C|I|^{-(1/2+n)}(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{-N} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right) \lambda^{-(n-k)}$$

$$\leq C(1 + \lambda^{-1})^N |I|^{-(1/2+n)}(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{-N}$$

which proves the statement.

Lemma 5.2. *Let* I, J *be two intervals such that* $|J| \leq |I|$. *Let* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \theta < 1$, $R \geq 1$ *and* $\lambda \geq R^{-1}(1 + |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)|)^{\theta}$.

Let ϕ_J *be an* L^2*-normalized bump function adapted to* J *with constant* C *and order* N.

Then, $\phi_J(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})$ *is an* L^2*-normalized bump function adapted to* I *with constant*

$$C 2^{\theta N/2} R^{N/2} \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-(1/2+\theta N/4)} \lambda^{-N/2}$$

and order $[\theta N/4]$.

Remark 5.3. *We will apply this result with* $\lambda = 1/32(|J|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))^{\theta}$, *for which the lemma says that* $\phi_J(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})$ *is an* L^2*-normalized bump function adapted to* I *with constant*

$$C 2^{\theta N/2} 2^{5N} \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4 - 1/2} \mathrm{rdist}(I, J)^{-\theta N/2}$$

and order $\theta N/4$. *We notice that, when applied, the constant will depend on* N *which, in turn, will be fixed.*

Proof. We study first the decay of $\phi_J(x)(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})(x)$. Accounting for the support of $1 - \Phi_{\lambda J}$ we only need to consider those values x such that $|x - c(J)| \geq \lambda |J|$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)| &\leq |J|^{-1}|x - c(J)| + 1 + |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \\ &\leq R|J|^{-1}|x - c(J)| + (R\lambda)^{1/\theta} \leq 2(R|J|^{-1}|x - c(J)|)^{1/\theta} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because $R|J|^{-1}|x - c(J)| \geq R\lambda \geq 1$ and $\theta \leq 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)| &\leq 2 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)| \\ &\leq 1 + 2 \cdot R^{1/\theta}(|J|^{-1}|x - c(J)|)^{1/\theta} \\ \leq 2 \cdot R^{1/\theta}((1 + (|J|^{-1}|x - c(J)|)^{1/\theta}) &\leq 2 \cdot R^{1/\theta}(1 + |J|^{-1}|x - c(J)|)^{1/\theta} \end{aligned}$$

With this and the inequality $|x - c(J)| \geq \lambda |J|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_J(x)(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})(x)| &\leq C|J|^{-1/2} \frac{1}{(1 + |J|^{-1}|x - c(J)|)^N} |(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})(x)| \\ &\leq C|J|^{-1/2} \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda)^{N/2}} \frac{1}{(1 + |J|^{-1}|x - c(J)|)^{N/2}} |(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})(x)| \\ &\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-1/2} \lambda^{-N/2} |I|^{-1/2} \frac{2^{\theta N/2} R^{N/2}}{(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{\theta N/2}} \end{aligned}$$

This demonstrates the desired decay.

We use a similar argument to deal with the derivatives. We first notice that, since Φ_I is L^{∞} -adapted to I, we have $|\Phi_I^{(k)}(x)| \leq C|I|^{-k}$. Then, as before, we have for all $0 \leq k \leq n \leq [\theta N/4]$,

$$|\phi_J^{(k)}(x)(1 - \Phi_{\lambda J})^{(n-k)}(x)|$$

$$\leq C|J|^{-(1/2+k)}\frac{1}{(1+|J|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^N}|\lambda J|^{-(n-k)}\chi_{4\lambda J\setminus 2\lambda J}(x)$$
$$= C|J|^{-(1/2+n)}\frac{1}{(1+|J|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^N}\lambda^{-(n-k)}\chi_{4\lambda J\setminus 2\lambda J}(x)$$
$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-(1/2+n)}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}\frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^{3N/4}}\frac{1}{(1+|J|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^{N/4}}\lambda^{-(n-k)}$$
$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-(1/2+n)}\lambda^{-N/2}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}\frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^{N/4}}\frac{2^{\theta N/4}R^{N/4}}{(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{\theta N/4}}\lambda^{-(n-k)}$$

Therefore, for all $0\leq n\leq[\theta N/4]$,

$$|(\phi_J(1-\Phi_{\lambda J}))^{(n)}(x)| = |\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right)\phi_J^{(k)}(x)(1-\Phi_{\lambda J})^{(n-k)}(x)|$$
$$\leq C2^{\theta N/4}R^{N/4}\lambda^{-N/2}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-(1/2+n)}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}\frac{1}{(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{\theta N/4}}$$
$$\frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^{N/4}}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right)\lambda^{-(n-k)}$$
$$\leq C2^{\theta N/2}R^{N/2}\lambda^{-N/2}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-(1/2+n)}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}\frac{1}{(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{\theta N/4}}$$

as wanted. We notice that in the last inequality we have used that $\lambda\geq R^{-1}$ implies

$$\frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^{N/4}}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array}\right)\lambda^{-(n-k)} = \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^{N/4}}(1+\lambda^{-1})^n$$
$$= \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^{N/4}}\lambda^{-n}(\lambda+1)^n \leq R^{\theta N/4}\leq R^{N/4}$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let I, J be two intervals such that $|J|\leq|I|$. Let $N\in\mathbb{N}$, $0<\theta\leq 1$, $R\geq 3$ and $\lambda\geq R^{-1}(|J|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J))^{\theta}$.*

Then, $|\lambda J|^{-1/2}\Phi_{\lambda J}$ is an L^2-normalized bump function adapted to I with constant

$$CR^{2N}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda^{(N-1)/2}$$

and order $[\theta N/4]$.

Proof. This time we may restrict ourselves to $|x-c(J)|\leq 2\lambda|J|$. Then,

$$|x-c(I)|\leq|x-c(J)|+|c(I)-c(J)|\leq 2\lambda|J|+|c(I)-c(J)|$$

and so,

$$1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|\leq\frac{|J|}{|I|}2\lambda+1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|$$

On the other hand,

$$1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|\leq 2|I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)\leq 2\frac{|J|}{|I|}(R\lambda)^{1/\theta}$$

Then,

$$1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|\leq \frac{|J|}{|I|}R\lambda + 2\frac{|J|}{|I|}(R\lambda)^{1/\theta}$$
$$\leq 3\frac{|J|}{|I|}(R\lambda)^{1/\theta}\leq R^{1+1/\theta}\frac{|J|}{|I|}\lambda^{1/\theta}$$

because $R\lambda \geq 1$ and $0<\theta\leq 1$. Therefore, since $|\Phi_I^{(n)}(x)|\lesssim |I|^{-n}$, we have for all $0\leq n\leq \theta N/4\leq N/4$,

$$|\lambda J|^{-1/2}|\Phi_{\lambda J}^{(n)}(x)|\lesssim \lambda^{-1/2}|J|^{-1/2}|\lambda J|^{-n}$$
$$\leq \lambda^{-(1/2+n)}|J|^{-(1/2+n)}R^{(\theta+1)N/2}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/2}\lambda^{N/2}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-\theta N/2}$$
$$\leq R^{N}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/2-1/2-n}\lambda^{-(1/2+n)}\lambda^{N/2}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-\theta N/4}$$
$$\leq R^{2N}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda^{(N-1)/2}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-\theta N/4}$$

again because $R\lambda\geq 1$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let J be an interval and $k\in\mathbb{N}$. We define $\phi_J(t)=|J|^{-1/2}(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)(t)(t-c(J))^k$.*

Then, ϕ_J is adapted to J with constant comparable to $2^{3k}k!|J|^k$ and order k.

Proof. We also define $h(t)=(t-c(J))^k$. Since $\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi$ is L^∞-adapted to J, we have $|(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)^{(j)}(t)|\lesssim |J|^{-j}$. Moreover, in the support of $\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi$ we have that $|t-c(J)|\leq 2|J|$ and $\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi\equiv 1$ on $|t-c(J)|\leq |J|$.

Then, for all $0\leq n\leq k$

$$|\phi_J^{(n)}(t)|\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n\\ j\end{array}\right)|J|^{-1/2}|(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)^{(j)}(t)||h^{(n-j)}(t)|$$
$$\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n\\ j\end{array}\right)|J|^{-1/2}|J|^{-j}\frac{k!}{(k-(n-j))!}|t-c(J)|^{k-(n-j)}$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n\\ j\end{array}\right)|J|^{-1/2}|J|^{-j}\frac{k!}{(k-(n-j))!}|J|^{k-(n-j)}$$
$$\leq k!|J|^k|J|^{-(1/2+n)}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c} n\\ j\end{array}\right)=2^nk!|J|^k|J|^{-(1/2+n)}$$
$$\leq 2^kk!|J|^k|J|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|J|^{-1}|t-c(J)|)^{-k}3^k$$

Lemma 5.6. *Let I,J be two intervals such that $c(I)=c(J)$. Let ϕ_J be a bump function adapted to J with constant $C>0$ and order N.*

Then, ϕ_J is a bump function adapted to I with constant $C\Big(\frac{\max(|I|,|J|)}{\min(|I|,|J|)}\Big)^{N+1/2}$ and order N.

Proof. When $|J|\leq|I|$, we have for all $0\leq n\leq N$,

$$|\phi_J^{(n)}(x)|\leq C|J|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|J|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^{-N}$$
$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\Big)^{1/2+n}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}$$

This shows that ϕ_J is a bump function adapted to I with constant $C\Big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\Big)^{N+1/2}$.

On the other hand, when $|I|\leq|J|$, we have for all $0\leq n\leq N$,

$$|\phi_J^{(n)}(x)|\leq C|J|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|J|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^{-N}$$
$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\Big)^{1/2+n}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}\Big(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\Big)^{-N}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|\Big)^{-N}$$
$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{N-(1/2+n)}|I|^{-(1/2+n)}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}$$

proving that ϕ_J is a bump function adapted to I with constant $C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{N-1/2}$.

We turn now to the main result of this section.

Proposition 5.7. *Let K be a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel with parameter δ. Let T be a linear operator with associated kernel K satisfying the weak compactness condition and the special cancellation condition $T(1)=0$.*

For every $0<\theta<\min(2^{-15},\delta/(1+\delta))$, we choose $\frac{8}{\theta}<N<\frac{1}{16\theta^2}$ and define $0<\delta'=\delta-\theta(1+\delta)<\delta$.

Then, there exists $C_{\delta'}>0$ such that for every $\epsilon>0$, for all intervals I,J with $|I|\geq|J|$ and all bump functions ϕ_I, ψ_J, L^2-adapted to I and J respectively with order N and constant $C>0$ and such that ψ_J has mean zero, we have

$$|\langle T(\phi_I),\psi_J\rangle|\leq C_{\delta'}C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{1/2+\delta'}\left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)}{|I|}\right)^{-(1+\delta')}$$
$$\Big(F(I_1,\ldots,I_6;M_{T,\epsilon})+\epsilon\Big)$$

where F is a function as given in the comments after Definition 2.10, but possibly associated with admissible functions satisfying Definitions 2.10 and 4.4 that are larger than those originally given. Here $I_1=I$, $I_2=J$, $I_3=\langle I\cup J\rangle$, $I_4=\lambda_1\tilde{I}$, $I_5=\lambda_2\tilde{I}$, $I_6=\lambda_2 J$ with $\lambda_1=|I|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)$, $\lambda_2=(|J|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))^{\theta}$ and $\tilde{I}$, the translate of I centered at $c(J)$. Notice that the value $M_{T,\epsilon}$ is given by the weak compactness property as explained in the remarks after Definition 2.10.

Remark 5.8. *As usual, for simplicity of notation we will not distinguish between the function F given after Definition 2.10 and the one given by the above proposition.*

Given two intervals I and J, we will denote $K_{min} = J$ and $K_{max} = I$ if $|J| \leq |I|$, while $K_{min} = I$ and $K_{max} = J$ otherwise.

By symmetry of the arguments and using the notation provided in Notation 2.9 we also have the following result.

Corollary 5.9. *Let T be a linear operator satisfying all the previously required properties and the special cancellation conditions $T(1) = 0$ and $T^*(1) = 0$.*

Let $0 < \theta < 1$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \delta' < \delta$ be as before. Then there exists $C_{\delta'} > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, all intervals I, J and all mean zero bump functions ψ_I, ψ_J, L^2-adapted to I and J respectively with order N and constant $C > 0$, we have

$$|\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle| \leq C_{\delta'} C \operatorname{ec}(I, J)^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta'} \operatorname{rdist}(I, J)^{-(1+\delta')}\Big(F(I_1, \ldots, I_6; M_{T,\epsilon})+\epsilon\Big)$$

Now, $I_1 = I$, $I_2 = J$, $I_3 = \langle I \cup J\rangle$, $I_4 = \lambda_1 \tilde{K}_{max}$, $I_5 = \lambda_2 \tilde{K}_{max}$, $I_6 = \lambda_2 K_{min}$ with $\lambda_1 = |K_{max}|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I \cup J)$, $\lambda_2 = (|K_{min}|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I \cup J))^{\theta}$ and $\tilde{K}_{max}$, the translate of K_{max} with the same centre as K_{min}.

Proof. For every interval K, let Φ_K be the usual smooth function L^∞-adapted to K such that $\Phi_K = 1$ on $2K$, $0 < \Phi_K < 1$ on $4K\backslash 2K$ and $\Phi_K = 0$ in $(4K)^c$. We also introduce the notation $w_K(x) = (1 + |K|^{-1}|x - c(K)|)$.

As in the statement, we fix $0 < \theta < \min(2^{-15}, \delta/(2+\delta))$ and $\frac{8}{\theta} < N < \frac{1}{16\theta^2}$. Notice that because of the small value of θ we have $\frac{1}{16\theta^2} - \frac{8}{\theta} > 1$ and so, we can find an integer in between.

Let $\psi(t, x) = \phi_I(t)\psi_J(x)$ which, by hypothesis, is adapted to $I \times J$ with constant C and order N and has mean zero in the variable x. Then, we decompose ψ in the following way:

$$\psi = \psi_{out} + \psi_{in}$$
$$\psi_{in}(t, x) = (\psi(t, x) - a(t))\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)$$

where $\lambda_2 = (|J|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I \cup J))^{\theta}$ and $a(t)$ is chosen so that ψ_{in}, and also ψ_{out}, have mean zero in the x variable.

We split again

$$\psi_{in} = \psi_{in,out} + \psi_{in,in}$$
$$\psi_{in,in}(t, x) = \psi_{in}(t, x)\Phi_{\lambda_1 \tilde{I}}(t)$$

with $\tilde{I}$ the translate of I centered at $c(J)$ and $\lambda_1 = |I|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I \cup J)$.

We first explain why $\psi_{in,in}$ is also adapted to $I \times J$ with constant comparable to C. We know that ψ_{in} is the sum of two bump functions. By Lemma 5.1 applied to the variable x we deduce that the first function is adapted to $I \times J$ with constant $C2^N$. By inequalities (30) and (31) below, we deduce that the second term is also adapted to $I \times J$ with constant C. This shows that ψ_{in} is adapted to $I \times J$ with constant $C2^N$. Moreover, applying Lemma 5.1 in the variable t, we finally have that $\psi_{in,in}$ is adapted to $I \times J$ with constant $C2^{2N}$. Since N is fixed, from now being we will not keep a track of the dependence of the constants with respect N.

Notice that all functions previously defined are sums of at most two functions of tensor product type and have mean zero in the variable x. For any tensor product of bump functions, $\psi = \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2$, we will denote $\Lambda(\psi) = \langle T(\psi_1), \psi_2\rangle$.

Then, we plan to bound $\Lambda(\psi_{out})$ by the weak compactness condition and the decay of the bump function; $\Lambda(\psi_{in,in})$ by the weak compactness condition plus the special cancellation condition $T(1) = 0$; and $\Lambda(\psi_{in,out})$ by the integral representation and the smoothness property of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel.

a) We start with

$$\psi_{out}(t,x) = \psi(t,x)(1 - \Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)) + a(t)\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x) \tag{29}$$

and we work to prove that each term is a bump function L^2-adapted to $I \times I$ with some gain in the constant.

For the first term, since ψ is adapted to $I \times J$, by Remark 5.3, we have that $\psi(t,x)(1 - \Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x))$ is adapted to $I \times I$ with constant

$$C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{\theta N/4-1/2} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-\theta N/2} \le C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-4}$$

because θ and N were chosen so that $\theta N > 8$.

On the other hand, since ψ_{out} has mean zero in the x-variable, we have for the second term that

$$a(t)\int \Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)\,dx = -\int \psi(t,x)(1 - \Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x))\,dx$$

and, by the definition of Φ and ψ,

$$|a(t)|\frac{2}{32}\lambda_2|J| \le \int_{|x-c(J)|\ge\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2|J|} |\psi(t,x)|dx$$

$$\le C|\phi_I(t)||J|^{-1/2}\int_{|x-c(J)|\ge\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2|J|} (1+|J|^{-1}|x-c(J)|)^{-N}dx$$

$$\le C|\phi_I(t)||J|^{-1/2}\lambda_2^{-(N-1)}|J|$$

with ϕ_I L^2-adapted to I. This implies

$$|a(t)| \le C|J|^{-1/2}\lambda_2^{-N}|\phi_I(t)| = C|\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2}\lambda_2^{-N+1/2}|\phi_I(t)| \tag{30}$$

and therefore,

$$|a(t)\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)| \le C\lambda_2^{-N+1/2}|\phi_I(t)||\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2}\Phi_{\lambda_2 J}(x)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 5.4, $|\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2}\Phi_{\lambda_2 J}$ is a bump function adapted to I with constant comparable to $(|J|/|I|)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda_2^{(N-1)/2}$. With this, we prove that $a(t)\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)$ decays with a gain of constant of

$$C\lambda_2^{-N+1/2}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda_2^{N/2-1/2} = C\lambda_2^{-N/2}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}$$

$$= C(|J|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J))^{-\theta N/2}\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}$$

$$= C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{3\theta N/4-1/2}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-\theta N/2} \leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{11/2}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-4}$$

That is, we obtain the estimate

$$|a(t)\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)| \leq C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{11/2}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-4}|\phi_I(t)|$$

In order to estimate higher derivatives, we proceed in a similar way. We denote by ∂_1 and ∂_2 the operators of partial differentiation with respect to the variables t and x, respectively. First, we notice that since $\partial_1^k\psi_{out}$ also has mean zero in the variable x, we have

$$a^{(k)}(t)\int \Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)\,dx = -\int \partial_1^k\psi(t,x)(1-\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x))\,dx$$

Therefore, we have as in (30),

$$|a^{(k)}(t)| \leq C\lambda_2^{-N+1/2}|\phi_I^{(k)}(t)||\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2} \tag{31}$$

with ϕ_I L^2-adapted to I.

Moreover, by Lemma 5.4 again, we have that $|\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2}\Phi_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}$ is a bump function adapted to I with constant comparable to $(|J|/|I|)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda_2^{(N-1)/2}$. Then,

$$|\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2}|\Phi^{(j)}_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(t)| \lesssim \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda_2^{(N-1)/2}|I|^{-1/2-(n-k)}w_I(t)^{-N}$$

This way, we have for all $k, j \leq [\theta N]$,

$$|a^{(k)}(t)\Phi^{(j)}_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)| \leq C\lambda_2^{-N+1/2}|\phi_I^{(k)}(t)||\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2}|\Phi^{(j)}_{\frac{1}{32}\lambda_2 J}(x)|$$

$$\leq C\lambda_2^{-N+1/2}|I|^{-(1/2+k)}w_I(t)^{-N}$$

$$\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda_2^{N/2-1/2}|I|^{-(1/2+j)}w_I(x)^{-N}$$

and as, before, we rewrite and bound the constant in the following way

$$C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta N/4-1/2}\lambda_2^{-N/2} = C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{3\theta N/4-1/2}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-\theta N/2}$$

$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{11/2}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-4}$$

This proves that the second function in (29) is adapted to $I\times I$ with an acceptable gain in the constant.

With all this work, we have finally that ψ_{out} is adapted to $I\times I$ with the stated gain of constant and so, by the weak compactness condition, for every $\epsilon>0$ there is $M_{T,\epsilon}$ such that

$$|\Lambda(\psi_{out})|\leq C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2}\operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-4}(F_W(I;M_{T,\epsilon})+\epsilon)$$

better decay than the one stated.

b) In working with $\psi_{in,in}$, we first argue that we can assume that $\partial_1^k\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)=0$ for any x and $0\leq k\leq N$.

The assumption comes from the substitution of $\psi_{in,in}(t,x)$ by

$$\psi_{in,in}(t,x)-(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{\frac{4}{32}\lambda_2|\tilde{I}|}\Phi)(t)\cdot\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)\tag{32}$$

$$-\sum_{k=1}^{N}(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)(t)\frac{1}{k!}(t-c(J))^k\cdot\partial_1^k\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)\tag{33}$$

We just need to prove that the subtracted terms satisfy the desired bounds. Notice the use of different dilations of Φ in the terms in (32) and (33).

Denote $\tilde{\psi}(x)=\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_k(x)=\partial_1^k\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)$. Since $\psi_{in,in}$ is adapted to $I\times J$ with constant comparable to C, we have that

$$|\tilde{\psi}(x)|\leq C|I|^{-1/2}(1+|I|^{-1}|c(J)-c(I)|)^{-N}|\varphi_J(x)|$$

with φ_J an L^2 normalized bump function adapted to J. Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)|&=|I|^{-1}(|I|+|c(I)-c(J)|)\\&\geq|I|^{-1}\operatorname{diam}(I,J)=\operatorname{rdist}(I,J)\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$|\tilde{\psi}(x)|\leq C|I|^{-1/2}\operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}|\varphi_J(x)|$$

On the other hand, we have that $\tilde{\psi}$ is supported in $\frac{4}{32}\lambda_2 J$ with mean zero. Then, by the special cancellation condition $T(1)=0$, the explicit error of Lemma 4.5 and the decay of $\tilde{\psi}$ just calculated, we can estimate the contribution of the term subtracted in (32) by

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{\frac{4}{32}\lambda_2|\tilde{I}|}\Phi),\tilde{\psi}\rangle|&=|\langle T(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{\frac{|I|}{|J|}|\frac{4}{32}\lambda_2 J|}\Phi),\tilde{\psi}\rangle-\langle T(1),\tilde{\psi}\rangle|\\&\leq C\left(\frac{|I|}{|J|}\right)^{-\delta}F_K(\lambda_2\tilde{I})\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}\\&\leq C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{\delta}F_K(\lambda_2\tilde{I})|I|^{-1/2}\operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}|J|^{1/2}\\&=C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{1/2+\delta}\operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}F_K(\lambda_2\tilde{I})\end{aligned}$$

which is better than the desired bound.

For the remaining subtracted terms, we will proceed in a different way since we intend to apply the weak compactness condition. As before, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{\psi}_k(x)| &\leq C|I|^{-(1/2+k)}(1+|I|^{-1}|c(J)-c(I)|)^{-N}|\varphi_J(x)|\\ &\leq C|I|^{-(1/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}|\varphi_J(x)|\end{aligned}$$

where φ_J is an L^2-normalized bump function adapted to J.

Since $\psi_{in,in}$ is adapted to $I\times J$ with constant comparable to C, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{\psi}_k^{(j)}(x)| &= |\partial_2^j\partial_1^k\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)|\\ &\leq C|I|^{-(1/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}|J|^{-(1/2+j)}w_J(x)^{-N}\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\tilde{\psi}_k$ is adapted to J with constant $C|I|^{-(1/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 5.5, we have that $|J|^{-1/2}(\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)(t)(t-c(J))^k$ is L^2-adapted to J with constant $2^{3k}k!|J|^k$ and order k. Then, by the weak compactness condition we have that for every $\epsilon>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\langle T((\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)(\cdot-c(J))^k),\tilde{\psi}_k\rangle|\\ &\leq C2^{3k}k!|J|^{1/2+k}|I|^{-(1/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}(F_W(J;M_{T,\epsilon})+\epsilon)\end{aligned}$$

This way, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{1}{k!}\langle T((\mathcal{T}_{c(J)}\mathcal{D}_{|J|}\Phi)(\cdot-c(J))^k),\tilde{\psi}_k\rangle\Big|\\ &\leq C\sum_{k=1}^{N}2^{3k}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{1/2+k}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}(F_W(J;M_{T,\epsilon})+\epsilon)\\ &\lesssim C2^{3N}\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}(F_W(J;M_{T,\epsilon})+\epsilon)\end{aligned}$$

which is, again, no larger than the desired bound.

This finishes the justification of the assumption $\partial_1^k\psi_{in,in}(c(J),x)=0$ for any x and any $0\leq k\leq N$. Now, with this assumption, we further decompose $\psi_{in,in}$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{in,in} &= \psi_{in,in,out}+\psi_{in,in,in}\\ \psi_{in,in,in}(t,x) &= \psi_{in,in}(t,x)\Phi_{\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2 J}(t)\end{aligned}$$

b1) We first prove that $\psi_{in,in,in}$ is adapted to $\lambda_2 J\times\lambda_2 J$ with constant

$$C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/4}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-7}$$

and order $N_2=[N^{1/2}]$.

First,

$$\partial_1^n\partial_2^j\psi_{in,in,in}(t,x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}\Phi^{(n-k)}_{\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2 J}(t)\partial_1^k\partial_2^j\psi_{in,in}(t,x) \tag{34}$$

On one side, we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\Phi^{(n-k)}_{\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2 J}(t)| \lesssim |\lambda_2 J|^{-(n-k)}\Phi_{\lambda_2 J}(t) \\
(35)\qquad &\lesssim |\lambda_2 J|^{1/2}|\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2-(n-k)}w_{\lambda_2 J}(t)^{-N_2}
\end{aligned}
$$

which shows that $\Phi_{\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2 J}$ is L^2-adapted to $\lambda_2 J$ with constant comparable to $|\lambda_2 J|^{1/2}$.

On the other side, since the support of $\psi_{in,in,in}$ in the variable t is in $\lambda_2 J$, for all $t \in \lambda_2 J$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have by the extra assumption,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(36)\qquad &|\partial_1^k \partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(t,x)| = \Big| \int_{c(J)}^t \partial_1^{k+1}\partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(r,x)\, dr \Big| \\
&\leq |t-c(J)| \|\partial_1^{k+1}\partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(\cdot,x)\|_\infty \leq \lambda_2 |J| \|\partial_1^{k+1}\partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(\cdot,x)\|_\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

By the definition of a bump function we have

$$
|\partial_1^{k+1}\partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(r,x)| \leq C|I|^{-(3/2+k)}(1+|I|^{-1}|r-c(I)|)^{-N}|\varphi_J^{(j)}(x)|
$$

where φ_J is an L^2-normalized bump function adapted to J, simply because $\psi_{in,in}(r,\cdot)$ is adapted to J. Now, from the particular choice of $\Phi_{\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2 J}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|r-c(J)| &\leq |t-c(J)| \leq 1/2\lambda_2|J| \\
&= 1/2|J|^{1-\theta}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)^\theta \leq 1/2\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)
\end{aligned}
$$

because $|J| \leq \mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)$, and so,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&1+|I|^{-1}|r-c(I)| \geq 1+|I|^{-1}|c(I)-c(J)| - |I|^{-1}|r-c(J)| \\
&\geq |I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J) - 1/2|I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J) = 1/2\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\|\partial_1^{k+1}\partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(\cdot,x)\|_\infty \leq C|I|^{-(3/2+k)}2^N\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}|\varphi_J^{(j)}(x)|
$$

Moreover, as in the proof of Lemma 5.6, we have that

$$
|\varphi_J^{(j)}(x)| \leq C\Big(\frac{|\lambda_2 J|}{|J|}\Big)^{1/2+j}|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)}(1+|\lambda_2 J|^{-1}|x-c(\lambda_2 J)|)^{-N_2}
$$

Then, with the two previous inequalities, we continue the estimate of (36) in the following way

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\partial_1^k\partial_2^j \psi_{in,in}(t,x)| \leq C\lambda_2|J||I|^{-(3/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}\lambda_2^{1/2+j}|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)}w_{\lambda_2 J}(x)^{-N_2} \\
&= C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2+k}|J|^{-(1/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}\lambda_2^{3/2+j}|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)}w_{\lambda_2 J}(x)^{-N_2} \\
&(37) \\
&= C\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2+k}|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+k)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}\lambda_2^{2+k+j}|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)}w_{\lambda_2 J}(x)^{-N_2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, with inequalities (35) and (37), we can bound (34), for all $0 \leq n, j \leq N_2$

$$|\partial_1^n \partial_2^j \psi_{in,in,in}(t,x)| \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) |\lambda_2 J|^{1/2} |\lambda_2 J|^{-1/2-(n-k)} w_{\lambda_2 J}(t)^{-N_2}$$

$$\left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2+k} |\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+k)} \, \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N} \lambda_2^{2+k+j} |\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)} w_{\lambda_2 J}(x)^{-N_2}$$

$$= C \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N} \lambda_2^{2+n+j} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{k} \lambda_2^{-(n-k)}$$

$$|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+n)} w_{\lambda_2 J}(t)^{-N_2} |\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)} w_{\lambda_2 J}(x)^{-N_2}$$

$$\leq C \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N} \lambda_2^{2+n+j} \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|} + \lambda_2^{-1}\Big)^{n}$$

$$|\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+n)} w_{\lambda_2 J}(t)^{-N_2} |\lambda_2 J|^{-(1/2+j)} w_{\lambda_2 J}(x)^{-N_2}$$

Now,

$$\lambda_2^{2+n+j} \leq \lambda_2^{2+2N_2} = (|J|^{-1} \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))^{2\theta(1+N_2)}$$
$$\leq \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{-2\theta(1+N_2)} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{2\theta(1+N_2)}$$

while

$$\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|} + \lambda_2^{-1}\Big)^{n} = \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|} + \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta} (|I|^{-1} \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))^{-\theta}\Big)^{n}$$

$$\leq \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta n} (1 + \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-\theta})^{n} \leq \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{\theta n} 2^{n} \leq 2^{N_2}$$

Both estimates together give us that $\psi_{in,in,in}$ is adapted to $\lambda_2 J \times \lambda_2 J$ with order N_2 and constant bounded by

$$C \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/2-2\theta(1+N_2)} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-(N-2\theta(1+N_2))}$$

$$\leq C \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/4} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-7}$$

because, from the choice of θ and N, we have $\theta^2 N < \frac{1}{16}$ and so, $\theta N_2 < \frac{1}{4}$. This implies $2\theta(1+N_2) < 2\theta + 1/2 < 3/4$.

Then, by the weak compactness property of T we get

$$|\Lambda(\psi_{in,in,in})| \leq C \left(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\right)^{3/4} \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-7} (F_W(\lambda_2 J; M_{T,\epsilon}) + \epsilon)$$

b2) We now work with $\psi_{in,in,out}$. When $\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2|J| > 2\lambda_1|I|$, we have that $\psi_{in,in,out}$ is the zero function and so, the right decay of $|\Lambda(\psi_{in,in,out})|$ is trivially satisfied. Hence, we only need to work in the case when $\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2|J| \leq 2\lambda_1|I|$.

In this case, by the extra assumption again, we have the following decay

$$|\psi_{in,in,out}(t,x)| \leq |\psi_{in,in}(t,x)| = \Big| \int_{c(J)}^{t} \partial_1 \psi_{in,in}(r,x)\, dr \Big|$$

$$\leq |t-c(J)| \|\partial_1 \psi_{in,in}(\cdot,x)\|_\infty$$

$$\leq C|t-c(J)||I|^{-3/2} \operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-N} |\varphi_J(x)| \tag{38}$$

where, as before, φ_J is an L^2-normalized bump function adapted to J with constant C.

On the support of $\psi_{in,in}$, we have that $|t-c(J)| \leq 2\lambda_1|\tilde{I}| = 2\lambda_1|I|$. Moreover, on the support of $\psi_{in,in,out}$ we have that $|t-c(J)| \geq \frac{8}{32}\lambda_2|J|$ and $|x-c(J)| \leq \frac{2}{32}\lambda_2|J|$. With the last two inequalities we obtain $2|x-c(J)| < |t-c(J)|$ and so, we can use the Calderón-Zygmund kernel representation to write

$$\Lambda(\psi_{in,in,out}) = \int \psi_{in,in,out}(t,x) K(x,t)\, dtdx$$

$$= \int \psi_{in,in,out}(t,x)(K(x,t) - K(c(J),t))\, dtdx$$

by the mean zero in the x-variable of $\psi_{in,in,out}$.

Now, since $2|x-c(J)| < |t-c(J)|$, we can use the smoothness property of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel. We recall that, as described in Definition 4.4, we have for some $0<\delta<1$ that

$$|K(x,t)-K(x',t)| \lesssim \frac{|x-x'|^\delta}{|x-t|^{1+\delta}} L(|x-t|) S(|x-x'|) D\Big(1+\frac{|x|}{1+|x-t|}\Big)$$

Note also the last remarks at the end of section 4.2.

This, together with the bound for $\psi_{in,in,out}$ in (38), allow us to bound in the following way:

$$|\Lambda(\psi_{in,in,out})| \lesssim \int |t-c(J)||I|^{-3/2} \operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-N} |\varphi_J(x)| \frac{|x-c(J)|^\delta}{|t-c(J)|^{1+\delta}}$$

$$L(|t-c(J)|) S(|x-c(J)|) D(1+(1+|t-c(J)|)^{-1}|c(J)|)\, dtdx$$

By using $2\lambda_1|I| > |t-c(J)| > \frac{8}{32}\lambda_2|J|$, $|x-c(J)| < \frac{2}{32}\lambda_2|J|$, $c(\lambda_2 J) = c(J)$, the monotonicity of L, S and D, and the L^∞ norm of φ_J ,we can estimate the last integral by

$$C|I|^{-3/2} \operatorname{rdist}(I,J)^{-N} |J|^{-1/2} \tag{39}$$

$$\int_{|x-c(J)|<2\lambda_2|J|} |x-c(J)|^\delta dx \int_{\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2|J|<|t-c(J)|<2\lambda_1|I|} \frac{1}{|t-c(J)|^\delta} dt$$

$$L(\lambda_2|J|) S(\lambda_2|J|) D(1+(1+\lambda_1|\tilde{I}|)^{-1}|c(\lambda_1\tilde{I})|)$$

Since $\delta < 1$, the product of the integrals is bounded by a constant times

$$(2\lambda_2|J|)^{1+\delta}((2\lambda_1|I|)^{1-\delta} - (\frac{8}{32}\lambda_2|J|)^{1-\delta}) \lesssim (\lambda_2|J|)^{1+\delta}(\lambda_1|I|)^{1-\delta}$$
$$= |J|^{(1-\theta)(1+\delta)}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{\theta(1+\delta)}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{1-\delta}$$
$$= |J|^{(1-\theta)(1+\delta)}|I|^{1-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}(|I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))^{1-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}$$
$$= |J|^{1+\delta-\theta(1+\delta)}|I|^{1-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{1-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}$$

Notice that the implied constant $C_{\delta'}$ grows to infinity as δ' tends to one.

Therefore, we can bound

$$|\Lambda(\psi_{in,in,out})| \lesssim |I|^{-3/2}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-N}|J|^{-1/2}$$
$$|J|^{1+\delta-\theta(1+\delta)}|I|^{1-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{1-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}F_K(\lambda_2 J, \lambda_1 \tilde{I})$$
$$= |J|^{1/2+\delta-\theta(1+\delta)}|I|^{-1/2-\delta+\theta(1+\delta)}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-(N-1+\delta-\theta(1+\delta))}F_K(\lambda_2 J, \lambda_1 \tilde{I})$$
$$= \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{1/2+\delta-\theta(1+\delta)}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-(N-1)}F_K(\lambda_2 J, \lambda_1 \tilde{I})$$
$$\leq \Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{1/2+\delta'}\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-7}F_K(\lambda_2 J, \lambda_1 \tilde{I})$$

c) It only remains to discuss $\psi_{in,out}$. On the support of $\psi_{in,out}$, we have that $|t - c(J)| > \lambda_1|I| = \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)$ and $|x - c(J)| \leq 2/32\lambda_2|J| = 2/32|J|^{1-\theta}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{\theta}$. Since $|J|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) \geq 1$ implies $|J|^{1-\theta}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{\theta} < \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)$, we have that $2|x - c(J)| < |t - c(J)|$ and so, the support of $\psi_{in,out}$ is disjoint with the diagonal. Therefore, we can use the Calderón-Zygmund kernel representation

$$\Lambda(\psi_{in,out}) = \int \psi_{in,out}(t,x)K(x,t)\,dtdx$$
$$= \int \psi_{in,out}(t,x)(K(x,t) - K(c(J),t))\,dtdx$$

by the zero mean of $\psi_{in,out}$ in the variable x.

Moreover, since $2|x - c(J)| < |t - c(J)|$, we can use the smoothness property of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel to estimate the last integral by

$$|\Lambda(\psi_{in,out})| \lesssim \int |\psi_{in,out}(t,x)|\frac{|x - c(J)|^{\delta}}{|t - c(J)|^{1+\delta}}L(|t - c(J)|)$$
$$S(|x - c(J)|)D(1 + (1 + |t - c(J)|)^{-1}|c(J)|)\,dtdx$$

Now, using $|t - c(J)| > \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)$, $|x - c(J)| < 2/32|J|^{1-\theta}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{\theta} < \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)$ and the monotonicity of L, S and D, we can estimate the last integral by

$$C|J|^{(1-\theta)\delta}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{\theta\delta}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J)^{-(1+\delta)}L(\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))S(\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))$$

$$\int_{|t-c(J)|>\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)} |\psi_{in,out}(t,x)|D(1+(1+|t-c(J)|)^{-1}|c(J)|)\,dtdx$$

and we work now with the integral. We momentarily denote $d = \operatorname{diam}(I \cup J)$. Then, the monotonicity of D allows us to bound the integral in the previous expression by

$$\sum_{k\geq 0}\int_{2^k d\leq|t-c(J)|<2^{k+1}d}|\psi_{in,out}(t,x)|dtdx\, D\Big(1+\frac{|c(J)|}{1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)}\Big) \tag{40}$$

Now, with $|c(I)| - |c(J)| \leq |c(I) - c(J)| \leq \operatorname{diam}(I \cup J)$ and $2^{k+1} \geq 2^k + 1/2$, we have

$$\begin{gathered}1+(1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))^{-1}|c(J)|\\ \geq (1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))^{-1}(1+2^k\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)+\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)/2+|c(J)|)\\ \geq (1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))^{-1}(1+2^k\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)+|c(I)|/2+|c(J)|/2)\\ \geq 1/2(1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))^{-1}(1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)+|c(I)|+|c(J)|)\\ \geq 1/2(1+(1+2^{k+1}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))^{-1}|c(I)+c(J)|)\\ = 1/2\operatorname{rdist}(2^{k+1}\langle I,J\rangle,\mathbb{B})\end{gathered}$$

This way, by the monotonicity of D again, the expression in (40) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{k\geq 0}\int_{2^k d\leq|t-c(J)|<2^{k+1}d}|\psi_{in,out}(t,x)|\,dtdx\, D(\operatorname{rdist}(2^{k+1}\langle I,J\rangle,\mathbb{B})) \tag{41}$$

We work now to bound the L^1 norm. Since $\psi_{in,out}$ is a bump function adapted to $I \times J$, we can bound in the following way

$$\begin{gathered}\int_{2^k d\leq|t-c(J)|<2^{k+1}d}|\psi_{in,out}(t,x)|\,dtdx\\ \leq C|I|^{-1/2}\int_{2^k d\leq|t-c(J)|}(1+|I|^{-1}|t-c(I)|)^{-N}dt\,|J|^{1/2}\\ \leq C|I|^{-1/2}(1+|I|^{-1}2^k d)^{-N}|I|\,|J|^{1/2}\\ = C|I|^{1/2}|J|^{1/2}(1+2^k\operatorname{rdist}(I,J))^{-N}\end{gathered}$$

Then, (41) can be bounded by

$$\begin{gathered}C|I|^{1/2}|J|^{1/2}\sum_{k\geq 0}(1+2^k\operatorname{rdist}(I,J))^{-N}D(\operatorname{rdist}(2^{k+1}\langle I,J\rangle,\mathbb{B}))\\ \leq C|I|^{1/2}|J|^{1/2}\sum_{k\geq 0}2^{-Nk}D(\operatorname{rdist}(2^{k+1}\langle I,J\rangle,\mathbb{B}))\\ \leq C|I|^{1/2}|J|^{1/2}\tilde{D}(\langle I,J\rangle)\end{gathered}$$

because $2^k\operatorname{rdist}(I,J) \geq 2^k \geq 1$, with $\tilde{D}(K) = \sum_{k\geq 0} 2^{-k} D(\operatorname{rdist}(2^{k+1}K,\mathbb{B}))$. Then, we finally bound

$$\begin{gathered}|\Lambda(\psi_{in,out})| \leq C|J|^{(1-\theta)\delta}\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J)^{-1-\delta+\theta\delta}|I|^{1/2}|J|^{1/2}\\ L(\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))S(\operatorname{diam}(I\cup J))\tilde{D}(\langle I,J\rangle)\end{gathered}$$

$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{1/2+(1-\theta)\delta}(|I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J))^{-1-(1-\theta)\delta}\tilde{F}_K(\langle I\cup J\rangle)$$
$$\leq C\Big(\frac{|J|}{|I|}\Big)^{1/2+\delta'}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J)^{-(1+\delta')}\tilde{F}_K(\langle I\cup J\rangle)$$

since $(1-\theta)\delta>\delta-\theta(1+\delta)=\delta'$.

This proves the desired estimate for $\Lambda(\psi_{in,out})$ and completes the proof.

□

6. L^p COMPACTNESS

We devote the first part of this section to describe in detail the way we decompose the time-frequency plane to obtain a particular type of wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and how we use this basis to decompose the operators under study.

Let $\phi\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ be an even function such that $\widehat{\phi}$ is supported in $\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}:|\xi|\leq 2\}$ and equals 1 on $\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}:|\xi|\leq 1\}$. Let ψ be the function $\psi(x)=\phi(x)-\phi(x/2)/2$. Then $\hat{\psi}$ is supported on the annulus $\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}:2^{-1}\leq|\xi|\leq 2\}$ and moreover $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\widehat{\psi}(\xi/2^k)=1$, for all $\xi\neq 0$.

We define the Littlewood-Paley projection operators in $\mathbb{R}$ given by $\mathcal{P}_k(f)=f*\mathcal{D}^1_{2^{-k}}\psi$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\leq k}(f)=f*\mathcal{D}^1_{2^{-k}}\phi$. We observe that $\mathcal{P}_{\leq k}(f)=\sum_{j\leq k}\mathcal{P}_j(f)$ and also that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathcal{P}_{\leq k}(f)=f$ while $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathcal{P}_{\leq -k}(f)=0$ where in the three cases the convergence is understood in the topology of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$.

Let us now consider the sequences of intervals $\omega_k=[2^{k-1},2^{k+1}]$, $\omega_k'=-\omega_k$. Since $\mathcal{P}_k(f)$ has Fourier support in $\omega_k\cup\omega_k'$, we have by Shannon's sampling theorem that

$$\mathcal{P}_k(f)=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_k}\langle f,\psi_{I,\omega_k}\rangle\psi_{I,\omega_k}$$

where the sum runs over $\mathcal{D}_k$, the family of all dyadic intervals I such that $|I|=c|\omega_k|^{-1}=c2^{-k}$, where c is a fixed constant and the convergence is understood again in the topology of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, ψ_{I,ω_k} are Schwartz functions such that $\mathrm{supp}\,\widehat{\psi_{I,\omega_k}}\subset\omega_k$ and $\tilde{\psi}_{I,\omega_k}(x)=e^{-2\pi ic(\omega_k)x}\psi_{I,\omega_k}(x)$ are bump functions adapted to I with any prescribed order N and constant $C>0$ depending only on the function ψ.

We show now that the functions ψ_{I,ω_k} are bump functions adapted to I of order N with the larger constant $C(5\pi c)^N$.

$$|\psi^{(n)}_{I,\omega_k}(x)|=|\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c}n\\k\end{array}\right)(2\pi ic(\omega_k))^k e^{2\pi ic(\omega_k)x}\tilde{\psi}^{(n-k)}_{I,\omega_k}(x)|$$

$$\leq C\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c}n\\k\end{array}\right)(2\pi|c(\omega_k)|)^k|I|^{-(1/2+n-k)}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}$$
$$=C(2\pi|c(\omega_k)|+|I|^{-1})^n|I|^{-1/2}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}$$

$$\leq C(5\pi c)^n |I|^{-1/2-n}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}$$

since, by construction, $|c(\omega_k)| = 5/4\, 2^k = c\, 5/4 |I|^{-1}$ and so, $2\pi|c(\omega_k)| + |I|^{-1} = 2\pi c\,(3/2+1)|I|^{-1}$.

From now we drop the index ω_k in the notation of ψ_I.

This construction allows us to represent any continuous operator T as a superposition of terms defined by the action of the operator over bump functions. We first show that

$$\langle T(f), g\rangle = \sum_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle T(\mathcal{P}_i f), \mathcal{P}_j g\rangle$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$.

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the operator T_N defined by

$$\langle T_N(f), g\rangle = \sum_{\substack{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}\\ |i|,|j|\leq N}} \langle T(\mathcal{P}_i f), \mathcal{P}_j g\rangle$$

Unfolding the sum we have, by bilinearity and the continuity of T in the topology of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle T_N(f), g\rangle \;=\;& \langle T(\mathcal{P}_{\leq N} f), \mathcal{P}_{\leq N} g\rangle - \langle T(\mathcal{P}_{\leq -(N+1)} f), \mathcal{P}_{\leq N} g\rangle \\ & - \langle T(\mathcal{P}_{\leq N} f), \mathcal{P}_{\leq -(N+1)} g\rangle + \langle T(\mathcal{P}_{\leq -(N+1)} f), \mathcal{P}_{\leq -(N+1)} g\rangle\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the continuity of T again, we have that the first term tends to $\langle T(f), g\rangle$ while the other three terms tend to zero. This implies, $\langle T(f), g\rangle = \lim_{N\to\infty}\langle T_N(f), g\rangle$ as we wanted.

It also follows that

$$\langle T(f), g\rangle = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{|i|,|j|\leq N} \langle T(\mathcal{P}_i f), \mathcal{P}_j g\rangle$$

$$= \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{|i|,|j|\leq N} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_i, J\in\mathcal{D}_j} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\langle g, \psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle$$

This means that we can write

$$\langle T(f), g\rangle = \sum_{I,J\in\mathcal{D}} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\langle g, \psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle$$

where the sums run over the whole family of dyadic intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, since

$$\langle P_M(T(f)), g\rangle = \langle T(f), P_M g\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\langle g, \psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle$$

we have that

$$\langle P_M^{\perp}(T(f)), g\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M^c} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\langle g, \psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle \tag{42}$$

where the summation is performed as in equation (2).

We prove now our main result about compactness of singular integral operators when they satisfy the special cancellation conditions.

Theorem 6.1. *(L^2 compactness in the special cancellation case). Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ be a continuous linear operator associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel. Assume that T satisfies the weak compactness condition and the special cancellation conditions $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$.*

Then T can be extended to a compact operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.11, in order to show compactness of T, we need to check that $P_M^\perp(T_b)$ converges to zero in the operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^2\to L^2}$ when M tends to infinity. For this, it is enough to prove that $\langle P_M^\perp(T(f)), g\rangle$ tends to zero uniformly for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ in the unit ball of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

We start by proving that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is $M_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $M > M_0$, we have $F(I_1, \ldots, I_6; M_{T,\epsilon}) \lesssim \epsilon$ for $I_i \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$. This will follow as a consequence of the inequality $F(I; M_{T,\epsilon}) \lesssim \epsilon$ for every $I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$. We notice that the implicit constants only depend on the admissible functions.

For $\epsilon > 0$ we remind the reader that $M_{T,\epsilon} > 0$ is a constant such that for any interval I and any ϕ_I, φ_I bump functions adapted to I with constant $C > 0$ and order N, we have

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| \leq C(F_W(I; M_{T,\epsilon}) + \epsilon)$$

For a fixed $M_{T,\epsilon} > 0$, there is $M_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, depending on $\epsilon, M_{T,\epsilon}$, with $M_0 > M_{T,\epsilon}$, such that for any $M > M_0$,

$$L_K(2^M) + S_K(2^{-M}) + D_K(M) < \epsilon$$

and

$$L_W(2^{M-M_{T,\epsilon}}) + S_W(2^{-(M-M_{T,\epsilon})}) + D_W(M/M_{T,\epsilon}) < \epsilon$$

Let $I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$. The claim is proven by considering the following cases:

(1) If $|I| > 2^M$ then, since L_K and L_W are non-increasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(I; M_{T,\epsilon}) &\lesssim L_K(|I|) + L_W(|I|/2^{M_{T,\epsilon}}) \\ &\leq L_K(2^M) + L_W(2^{M-M_{T,\epsilon}}) < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $|I| < 2^{-M}$ then, since S_K and S_W are non-decreasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(I; M_{T,\epsilon}) &\lesssim S_K(|I|) + S_W(2^{M_{T,\epsilon}}|I|) \\ &\leq S_K(2^{-M}) + S_W(2^{-(M-M_{T,\epsilon})}) < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

(3) If $2^{-M} \leq |I| \leq 2^M$ with $\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) > M$ then, as we saw in the remark after Definition 2.12, $|c(I)| > (M-1)2^M$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^{M_{T,\epsilon}}}) &\geq 1 + \frac{|c(I)|}{\max(|I|, 2^{M_{T,\epsilon}})} \\ &\geq 1 + \frac{(M-1)2^M}{\max(2^M, 2^{M_{T,\epsilon}})} = M \end{aligned}$$

This way, $M_{T,\epsilon}^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^{M_{T,\epsilon}}}) \geq M/M_{T,\epsilon}$. We can apply a similar reasoning to show that we also have $\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}) > M$.

Then, since D_W is non-increasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(I;M_{T,\epsilon}) &\lesssim D_K(\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B})) + D_W(M_{T,\epsilon}^{-1}\,\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^{M_{T,\epsilon}}})) \\ &\leq D_K(M) + D_W(M/M_{T,\epsilon}) < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Now, for every fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and chosen $M_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we are going to prove that for all $M > M_0$ such that $M2^{-M\delta} + M^{-\delta} < \epsilon$, we have

$$|\langle P_{2M}^{\perp}(T(f)), g\rangle| \lesssim \epsilon$$

with the implicit constant depending on $\delta > 0$ and the constant given by the wavelets basis.

By equation (42), we have that

$$\langle P_{2M}^{\perp}(T(f)), g\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\langle f,\psi_I\rangle\langle g,\psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle \tag{43}$$

where $(\psi_I)_I$ is the wavelet basis given in the remarks preceding the statement of the theorem. Note that there exist a fixed order N and constant C, such that each ψ_I is adapted to I with constant C and order N. Furthermore, we are free to choose this N so as to ensure that Corollary 5.9 applies.

From now on, we work to obtain bounds of the expression (43) when the sum runs over finite families of dyadic intervals in such way that the bounds are independent of the particular families of intervals. In view of the rate of decay stated in Corollary 5.9, we parametrize the sums according to eccentricities and relative distances of the intervals:

$$\langle P_{2M}^{\perp}(T(f)), g\rangle = \sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{J\in\,\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}\langle f,\psi_I\rangle\langle g,\psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle$$

where for fixed eccentricity $e \in \mathbb{Z}$, relative distance $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every given interval J, we define the family

$$J_{e,n} = \{I \in \mathcal{D} : |I| = 2^e|J|, n \leq \,\mathrm{rdist}(I,J) < n+1\}$$

Notice that by symmetry the family $\{(I,J) : J \in I_{e,n}\}$ can be also parameterized as $\{(I,J) : I \in J_{-e,n}\}$.

We bound the previous expression in the obvious way,

$$|\langle P_{2M}^{\perp}(T(f)), g\rangle| \leq \sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{J\in\,\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}|\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle||\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|$$

With δ denoting δ' of Corollary 5.9, we have that given $\epsilon > 0$ and $M_{T,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle| \lesssim 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)}\big(F(I_1,\ldots,I_6;M_{T,\epsilon}) + \epsilon\big)$$

where $I_1 = I$, $I_2 = J$, $I_3 = \langle I,J\rangle$, $I_4 = \lambda_1\tilde{K}_M$, $I_5 = \lambda_2\tilde{K}_M$ and $I_6 = \lambda_2 K_m$ with parameters $\lambda_1,\lambda_2 \geq 1$ explicitly provided by the mentioned corollary. To simplify notation, we will simply write $F(I_i)$. We also notice that the implicit constant might depend on δ and the wavelet basis, but it is universal otherwise.

Therefore, we can bound

$$|\langle P_{2M}^{\perp}(T(f)), g\rangle| \lesssim \sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)} \big(F(I_i)+\epsilon\big)|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle| \tag{44}$$

Now, in order to estimate this last quantity, we divide the study into six cases:

(1) $I_i\notin\mathcal{D}_M$ for all $i=1,\dots,6$

(2) $I\in\mathcal{D}_M$

(3) $\langle I\cup J\rangle\in\mathcal{D}_M$

(4) $I\notin\mathcal{D}_M$ but $\lambda_1\tilde{K}_{max}\in\mathcal{D}_M$

(5) $I\notin\mathcal{D}_M$ but $\lambda_2\tilde{K}_{max}\in\mathcal{D}_M$

(6) $I\notin\mathcal{D}_M$ but $\lambda_2 K_{min}\in\mathcal{D}_M$

1) In the first case, we have that $F(I_i)<\epsilon$. Then, by Cauchy's inequality, we bound the terms in (44) corresponding to this case by

$$2\epsilon\sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)}\Big(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{J\in I_{-e,n}}|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}|\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|^2\Big)^{1/2}$$

Now, for every fixed J and each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ there are $2^{-\min(e,0)}$ dyadic intervals I such that $|I|=2^e|J|$ and $n\le \operatorname{rdist}(I\cup J)<n+1$. This implies that the cardinality of $J_{e,n}$ is $2^{-\min(e,0)}$. For the same reason, the cardinality of $I_{-e,n}$ is $2^{-\min(-e,0)}=2^{\max(e,0)}$. Therefore, the previous expression coincides with

$$\begin{aligned}
2\epsilon\sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)} &\Big(2^{\max(e,0)}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle|^2\Big)^{1/2}\\
&\Big(2^{-\min(e,0)}\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}}|\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|^2\Big)^{1/2}\\
\le 2\epsilon\sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}2^{\max(e,0)/2}2^{-\min(e,0)/2}&\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}n^{-(1+\delta)}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2\\
=2\epsilon\Big(\sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}2^{-|e|\delta}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}n^{-(1+\delta)}\Big)&\|f\|_2\|g\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

since $2^{\max(e,0)}2^{-\min(e,0)}=2^{|e|}$. This finishes the first case.

In the remaining cases, we will not use the smallness of F. Instead, we will use the particular geometrical disposition of the intervals I and J, which make either their eccentricity or their relative distance very extreme. We recall that the intervals I and J in the sum (44) satisfy $|I|=2^e|J|$ and $n\le\operatorname{rdist}(I,J)<n+1$.

2) We deal with the case when $I\in\mathcal{D}_M$, that is, when $2^{-M}\le|I|\le 2^M$ and $\operatorname{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})\le M$. Notice that, since F is bounded, we can estimate $F(I_i)+\epsilon\lesssim 1$.

Since $J \in \mathcal{D}_{2M}^c$, we separate the study into the three usual cases: $|J| > 2^{2M}$, $|J| < 2^{-2M}$ and $2^{-2M} \leq |J| \leq 2^{2M}$ with $\mathrm{rdist}(J, \mathbb{B}_{2^{2M}}) > 2M$.

2.1) In the case $|J| > 2^{2M}$, we first notice that whenever $e \geq 0$ we have that $|I| \geq |J| \geq 2^{2M}$, which is contradictory with $I \in \mathcal{D}_M$. On the other hand, whenever $e \leq 0$ we have $2^e|J| = |I| \leq 2^M$ and so, $2^e \leq 2^M|J|^{-1} \leq 2^{-M}$, that is, $e \leq -M$. Then, we bound those terms in (44) corresponding to this case by

$$\begin{aligned} C \sum_{e\,\leq\,-M} \sum_{n\geq 1} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)} n^{-(1+\delta)} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c} \sum_{I\in J_{e,n}} |\langle f, \psi_I\rangle||\langle g, \psi_J\rangle| \\ \lesssim \sum_{e\,\leq\,-M} \sum_{n\geq 1} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)} n^{-(1+\delta)} 2^{|e|/2} \|f\|_2\|g\|_2 \\ = \Big(\sum_{e\,\leq\,-M} 2^{-|e|\delta} \sum_{n\geq 1} n^{-(1+\delta)} \Big) \|f\|_2\|g\|_2 \\ \lesssim 2^{-M\delta}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 < \epsilon\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

by the choice of M.

2.2) The case $|J| < 2^{-2M}$ is totally symmetrical and amounts to changing $e \leq -M$ by $e \geq M$ in previous case.

2.3) Finally, we deal with the case when $2^{-2M} \leq |J| \leq 2^{2M}$ and $\mathrm{rdist}(J, \mathbb{B}_{2^{2M}}) \geq 2M$. Then, $|J| = 2^k$ with $-2M \leq k \leq 2M$ and $|c(J)| \geq (2M-1)2^{2M}$. Since $I \in \mathcal{D}_M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M \geq \mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) = 2^{-M}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \\ = 2^{-M}(2^{M-1} + |I|/2 + |c(I)|) \geq 2^{-M}(2^{M-1} + |c(I)|) \end{aligned}$$

and then, $|c(I)| \leq (M - 1/2)2^M$. This implies

$$|c(I) - c(J)| \geq |c(J)| - |c(I)| \geq 2M2^{2M} - (M-1/2)2^M \geq M2^{2M}$$

Therefore, for $e \leq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} n + 1 > \mathrm{rdist}(I, J) = |J|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) \geq |J|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \\ \geq 2^{-2M}M2^{2M} = M \end{aligned}$$

while for $e \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} n + 1 > \mathrm{rdist}(I, J) = |I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) \geq |I|^{-1}|c(I) - c(J)| \\ \geq 2^{-M}M2^{2M} > M \end{aligned}$$

This way, we bound the relevant terms in (44) by

$$\begin{aligned} C \sum_{e\,\in\,\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n\geq M-1} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)} n^{-(1+\delta)} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c} \sum_{I\in J_{e,n}} |\langle f, \psi_I\rangle||\langle g, \psi_J\rangle| \\ \lesssim \Big(\sum_{e\,\in\,\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-|e|\delta} \sum_{n\geq M-1} n^{-(1+\delta)} \Big) \|f\|_2\|g\|_2 \\ \lesssim M^{-\delta}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 < \epsilon\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

again by the choice of M.

3) Now, we deal with the case when $\langle I\cup J\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_M$, that is, when $2^{-M} \le |\langle I\cup J\rangle| \le 2^M$ and $\mathrm{rdist}(\langle I,J\rangle, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \le M$. Both things imply that $2^{-M} \le \mathrm{diam}(I\cup J) \le 2^M$ and $|c(\langle I\cup J\rangle)| \le M2^M$.

Moreover, we have that $c(\langle I\cup J\rangle) = 1/2(c(I)+c(J)+\alpha(|I|-|J|))$ with $\alpha\in\{-1,1\}$. Then,

$$|c(I)+c(J)| \le 2|c(\langle I\cup J\rangle)|+||I|-|J|| \le 2M2^M+|\langle I\cup J\rangle| \le 2(M+1)2^M$$

3.1) When $|J| > 2^{2M}$ we have that $|\langle I\cup J\rangle| \ge |J| > 2^{2M}$ implies $\langle I\cup J\rangle \notin \mathcal{D}_M$ and so, we do not need to consider this case.

3.2) When $2^{-2M} \le |J| \le 2^{2M}$ with $\mathrm{rdist}(J,\mathbb{B}_{2^{2M}}) \ge 2M$, we have that $|c(J)| > (2M-1)2^{2M} > M2^M$.

If $\mathrm{sign}\, c(I) = -\mathrm{sign}\, c(J)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle I\cup J\rangle| &= \mathrm{diam}(I,J) \ge |c(I)-c(J)|\\ &= |c(I)|+|c(J)| > |c(J)| > M2^{2M}\end{aligned}$$

which is contradictory with $\langle I\cup J\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_M$.

Otherwise, if $\mathrm{sign}\, c(I) = \mathrm{sign}\, c(J)$ we have

$$|c(I)+c(J)| = |c(I)|+|c(J)| > M2^{2M}$$

which is also contradictory for the same reason. So, we do not need to consider this case either.

3.3) The only remaining case is when $|J| < 2^{-2M}$. When $e\le 0$, we have

$$n+1 > \mathrm{rdist}(I,J) = |J|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J) \ge 2^{2M}2^{-M} = 2^M$$

Meanwhile, when $e \ge 0$,

$$n+1 > |I|^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J) = 2^{-e}|J|^{-1}|\langle I\cup J\rangle| \ge 2^{-e}2^{2M}2^{-M} = 2^{M-e}$$

We bound the relevant part of (44) by a constant times

$$\sum_{e\,\le\,0}\ \sum_{n\ge 2^M-1} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^c_{2M}}\ \sum_{I\in J_{e,n}} |\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|$$

$$+\sum_{e\,\ge\,0}\ \sum_{n\ge \max(2^{M-e}-1,1)} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}^c_{2M}}\ \sum_{I\in J_{e,n}} |\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|$$

$$\le \Big(\sum_{e\,\le\,0} 2^{-|e|\delta} \sum_{n\ge 2^{M-1}} n^{-(1+\delta)}\Big)\|f\|_2\|g\|_2$$

$$+\Big(\sum_{0\,\le\,e\,\le\,M-1} 2^{-|e|\delta} \sum_{n\ge 2^{M-e}-1} n^{-(1+\delta)} + \sum_{M\,\le\,e} 2^{-|e|\delta}\sum_{n\ge 1} n^{-(1+\delta)}\Big)\|f\|_2\|g\|_2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-M\delta}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 + \Big(\sum_{0\,\le\,e\,\le\,M-1} 2^{-e\delta}2^{-(M-e)\delta} + \sum_{M\,\le\,e} 2^{-e\delta}\Big)\|f\|_2\|g\|_2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-M\delta}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 + (M2^{-M\delta}+2^{-M\delta})\|f\|_2\|g\|_2 < \epsilon\|f\|_2\|g\|_2$$

6) We deal now with the case $\lambda_2 K_{min} \in \mathcal{D}_M$.

6.1) When $|J| > 2^{2M}$, we have two cases. Whenever $e > 0$ then, $K_{min} = J$ and so, $|\lambda_2 J| \geq |J| \geq 2^{2M}$ which is contradictory with $\lambda_2 J \in \mathcal{D}_M$.

On the other hand, when $e \leq 0$ we have $K_{min} = I$ and $|I| \leq |\lambda_2 I| \leq 2^M$. Then, $2^e = |I|/|J| \leq 2^{-M}$ and so, $e \leq -M$. Therefore, previous arguments show that the correspoding part of (44) can be bounded by $\epsilon \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2$.

6.2) When $2^{-2M} \leq |J| \leq 2^{2M}$ with $\mathrm{rdist}(J, \mathbb{B}_{2^{2M}}) \geq 2M$, we have as before that $|c(J)| > (2M-1)2^{2M}$. Then, since we also have $2^{-M} \leq |\lambda_2 J| \leq 2^M$ with $\mathrm{rdist}(\lambda_2 J, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) \leq M$ we deduce that

$$M \geq \mathrm{rdist}(\lambda_2 J, \mathbb{B}_{2^M}) = 2^{-M} \mathrm{diam}(\lambda_2 J \cup \mathbb{B}_{2^M})$$

$$> 2^{-M} |c(J)| \geq (2M-1) 2^M$$

which is also contradictory.

6.3) When $|J| < 2^{-2M}$, we have from $|\lambda_2 J| \geq 2^{-M}$ that $\lambda_2 \geq 2^{-M} |J|^{-1} > 2^M$. Therefore, if $e \leq 0$, we have

$$2^M < \lambda_2 = (|J|^{-1} \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J))^\theta \leq |J|^{-1} \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) < n+1$$

which implies $n > 2^{M/2}$.

Meanwhile, if $e \geq 0$, we have

$$2^M < \lambda_2 \leq |J|^{-1} \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) = 2^e |I|^{-1} \mathrm{diam}(I \cup J) \leq 2^e (n+1)$$

and so, either $e > M/2$ or $n+1 > 2^{M/2}$. In any of these cases, previous arguments show again that the relevant part of (44) can be bounded by $\epsilon \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2$.

Finally, we notice that similar type of calculations are enough to deal with the other two remaining cases 4) and 5). This finishes the proof of compactness on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

From the classical David and Journé's $T(1)$ theorem, we know that the operator T is bounded on any $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ with $1 < p < \infty$. Therefore, since we have proven T to be compact on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, we can use classical interpolation techniques to also obtain compactness of T on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for all $1 < p < \infty$.

We refer to the following theorem, whose proof, in a more general setting, can be found in [9] and also in [3].

Theorem 6.2. *Let $1 \leq p_1, r_1, p_2, r_2 \leq \infty$ be a set of indices with $r_1 < \infty$. Let T be a given linear operator which is continuous simultaneously as a mapping from L^{p_1} to L^{r_1} and from L^{p_2} to L^{r_2}. Assume in addition that T is compact as a mapping from L^{p_1} to L^{r_1}. Then T is compact as a mapping from L^p to L^r, where $1/p = t/p_1 + (1-t)/p_2$, $1/r = t/r_1 + (1-t)/r_2$, $0 < t < 1$.*

7. Compact Paraproducts

For the proof of compactness on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ in the general case, that is, without the special cancellation conditions, we follow the same scheme as in the proof of the classical $T(1)$ theorem. When $b_1 = T(1)$ and $b_2 = T^*(1)$ are arbitrary functions in $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$, we construct compact paraproducts T_b associated with compact Calderón-Zymund kernels such that $T_{b_1}(1) = b_1$, $T^*_{b_1}(1) = 0$. The operator

$$\tilde{T} = T - T_{b_1} - T^*_{b_2}$$

then satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1, and therefore $\tilde{T}$ is compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, since the operators T_{b_1} and $T^*_{b_2}$ are compact by construction, we deduce that the initial operator T is also compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$.

We remark that, as we will later see in full detail, the appropriate paraproducts are exactly the same ones as in the classical setting, with the only difference being that the parameter functions b_i belong to the space $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ instead of $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proposition 7.1. *Given a function b in $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a linear operator T_b associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel such that T_b and T^*_b are compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for all $1 < p < \infty$ and it satisfies $\langle T_b(1), g\rangle = \langle b, g\rangle$ and $\langle T_b(f), 1\rangle = 0$, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$.*

Remark 7.2. *Once the proposition is proven, the required operators to finish our program will be $T^1_{b_1} = T_{b_1}$ and $T^2_{b_2} = T^*_{b_2}$.*

Proof. Let $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a wavelet basis of $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ such that each ψ_I is an L^2-normalized bump function supported and adapted to I with constant $C > 0$ and order N.

We denote by ϕ a positive bump function supported and adapted to $[-1/2, 1/2]$ with order N and integral one. Then, we have that $0 \leq \phi(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-N}$ and $|\phi'(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-N}$. Notice we can take $C = N$. Let $(\phi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be the family of bump functions defined by $\phi_I = \mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}^1_{|I|}\phi$. Then, it is clear that each ϕ_I is an L^1-normalized bump function adapted to I and so, satisfying $\phi_I(x) \leq C|I|^{-1}(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{-N}$ and $|\phi'_I(x)| \leq C|I|^{-2}(1 + |I|^{-1}|x - c(I)|)^{-N}$.

We define the linear operator T_b by

$$\langle T_b(f), g\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I\rangle\langle f, \phi_I\rangle\langle g, \psi_I\rangle$$

Since $b \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$, we know T_b is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ and, at least formally, it satisfies $\langle T_b(1), g\rangle = \langle b, g\rangle$ and $\langle T_b(f), 1\rangle = 0$.

We will now prove that T_b is compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. The fact that also T^*_b is compact on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ follows by symmetry. We need to verify that $P^{\perp}_M(T_b)$ converges to zero in the operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p\to L^p}$. This is equivalent to proving that $\langle P^{\perp}_M(T_b(f)), g\rangle$ tends to zero uniformly for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ in the unit ball of $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ and $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})$ respectively.

We know that $P_M^\perp(g) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M^c}\langle g,\psi_I\rangle\psi_I$. Moreover, since $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ can be chosen so that it is also a wavelet basis on CMO($\mathbb{R}$) (see the comments in Lemma 2.16), we have $P_M^\perp(b) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M^c}\langle b,\psi_I\rangle\psi_I$. Then,

$$\langle P_M^\perp(T_b(f)), g\rangle = \langle T_b(f), P_M^\perp(g)\rangle$$

$$= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\langle b,\psi_I\rangle\langle f,\phi_I\rangle\langle P_M^\perp(g),\psi_I\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_M^c}\langle b,\psi_I\rangle\langle f,\phi_I\rangle\langle g,\psi_I\rangle$$

$$= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\langle P_M^\perp(b),\psi_I\rangle\langle f,\phi_I\rangle\langle g,\psi_I\rangle = \langle T_{P_M^\perp(b)}(f), g\rangle \tag{45}$$

Now, by the boundedness of $T_{P_M^\perp(b)}$, we have

$$|\langle P_M^\perp(T_b(f)), g\rangle| \lesssim \|P_M^\perp(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}\|g\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|P_M^\perp(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}$$

which tends to zero when M tends to infinity.

To finish the proof, we still need to prove that T_b belongs to the class of operators for which the theory applies. In particular, we must show that it has the integral representation of Definition 2.6 with a kernel satisfying the Definition 2.3 of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel. For any $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ with disjoint support, we have

$$\langle T_b(f), g\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\langle b,\psi_I\rangle\langle f,\phi_I\rangle\langle g,\psi_I\rangle$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)g(x)\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\langle b,\psi_I\rangle\phi_I(t)\psi_I(x)dtdx$$

As we will see later, disjoint supports of f and g implies the convergence of the infinite sum. The kernel of T_b is hence given by

$$K(x,t) = \Big\langle b, \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\phi_I(t)\psi_I(x)\psi_I\Big\rangle$$

We will now check that K satisfies Definition 2.3 of a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel:

$$|K(x,t) - K(x,t')| \lesssim \frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}L(|x-t|)S(|x-t|)D(|x+t|)$$

whenever $2|t-t'| < |x-t|$. The analogous statement for $|K(x,t) - K(x',t)|$ follows similarly. Actually, we are going to prove that $|K(x,t) - K(x,t')|$ can be dominated by $|t-t'|/|x-t|^2$ times a bounded function which tends to zero when $|x-t|$ tends zero, when $|x-t|$ tends to infinity and when $|x+t|$ tends to infinity (cf. Section 4.2).

First of all, we have that

$$K(x,t) - K(x,t') = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}}\langle b,\psi_I\rangle(\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x)$$

Moreover, we notice that $(\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x) \neq 0$ implies that $x, t, t' \in 2I$ for all intervals in the sum. By symmetry, we can assume

$|x-t'| \leq |x-t|$. Let $I_{x,t}$ be the smallest dyadic interval containing x, t and t'. Notice that $|x-t| \leq 2|I_{x,t}|$ and that

$$K(x,t)-K(x,t') = \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D} \\ I_{x,t} \subset I}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle (\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x) \tag{46}$$

Since $b \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|P_M^{\perp}(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} < \epsilon$ and $2^{-M} < \epsilon$. We are going to prove that

$$|K(x,t)-K(x,t')| \lesssim \frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}\epsilon$$

when $|x-t| > 2^M$, $|x+t| > M2^{M+1}$ or $|x-t| \leq 2|I_{x,t}| < 2^{-3M/2}(1+\|b\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})})^{-1/2}$.

1) When $|x-t| > 2^M$ we have that all intervals I in the sum satisfy $|I| > |x-t| > 2^M$ and so, $I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$. We can rewrite equation (46) as

$$\begin{aligned} K(x,t)-K(x,t') &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle (\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x) \\ &= \Big\langle P_M^{\perp}(b), \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} (\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x)\psi_I \Big\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$|K(x,t)-K(x,t')| \leq \|P_M^{\perp}(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \Big\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} (\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x)\psi_I \Big\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

With the use of the square function S, the H^1-norm is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\| S\Big(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} (\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t'))\psi_I(x)\psi_I \Big) \Big\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big(\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D} \\ I_{x,t} \subset I}} |\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t')|^2 |\psi_I(x)|^2 \frac{\chi_I(y)}{|I|} \Big)^{1/2} dy \end{aligned}$$

Let $(I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the family of dyadic intervals such that $I_{x,t} \subset I_k$ with $|I_k| = 2^k |I_{x,t}|$. We also define $I_{-1} = \emptyset$. Then, we can rewrite the previous integral as

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \int_{I_k \backslash I_{k-1}} \Big(\sum_{j \geq k} |\phi_{I_j}(t) - \phi_{I_j}(t')|^2 |\psi_{I_j}(x)|^2 \frac{\chi_{I_j}(y)}{|I_j|} \Big)^{1/2} dy$$

Now, since the integrand is constant on every interval $I_k \backslash I_{k-1}$, the integral can be bounded by

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \Big(\sum_{j \geq k} |\phi_{I_j}(t) - \phi_{I_j}(t')|^2 |\psi_{I_j}(x)|^2 \frac{1}{|I_j|} \Big)^{1/2} |I_k \backslash I_{k-1}| \tag{47}$$

Since

$$|\phi_I(t) - \phi_I(t')| \leq \|\partial_t \phi_I\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} |t-t'| \leq C|I|^{-2}|t-t'|$$

and $|\psi_I(x)| \leq C|I|^{-1/2}(1+|I|^{-1}|x-c(I)|)^{-N}$, we bound (47) by a constant times

$$\sum_{k\geq 0}\Big(\sum_{j\geq k}\frac{1}{|I_j|^4}\frac{1}{|I_j|}\frac{1}{|I_j|}\Big)^{1/2}|I_k||t-t'| = \sum_{k\geq 0}\Big(\sum_{j\geq k}\frac{1}{|I_{x,t}|^6}\frac{1}{2^{6j}}\Big)^{1/2}2^k|I_{x,t}||t-t'|$$

$$= \sum_{k\geq 0}\Big(\sum_{j\geq k}\frac{1}{2^{6j}}\Big)^{1/2}2^k\frac{|t-t'|}{|I_{x,t}|^2} \lesssim \sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{1}{2^{3k}}2^k\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2} \lesssim \frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}$$

We have obtained

$$|K(x,t)-K(x,t')| \lesssim \|P_M^{\perp}(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2} \leq \epsilon\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}$$

by the choice of M.

2) We work now with the case when $|x+t| > M2^{M+1}$. Since every interval I in the sum satisfies $I_{x,t} \subset I$, we have $(x+t)/2 \in I$ and so, $|c(I)-(x+t)/2| < |I|/2$. This, in turn, implies $|c(I)| \geq |x+t|/2-|I|/2$.

Now, if $|I| > 2^M$ we have as before, $I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$. On the other hand, if $|I| \leq 2^M$ we get

$$\mathrm{rdist}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M}) = \frac{\mathrm{diam}(I,\mathbb{B}_{2^M})}{2^M} = \frac{|c(I)|+2^{M-1}+|I|/2}{2^M}$$

$$\geq \frac{|x+t|/2+2^{M-1}}{2^M} = \frac{|x+t|}{2^{M+1}}+\frac{1}{2} > M$$

by the property of $|x+t|$. Therefore, we also obtain $I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$ and as in the previous case we conclude that

$$|K(x,t)-K(x,t')| \lesssim \|P_M^{\perp}(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2} \leq \epsilon\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}$$

3) The last case, when $|x-t|$ is small, is a bit more involved. When $|x-t| < 2^{-3M/2}(1+\|b\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})})^{-1/2}$, those intervals in the sum such that $|I| < 2^{-M}$ or $|I| > 2^M$ satisfy that $I \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$ and may be taken care of as in the previous cases.

However, those intervals such that $2^{-M} \leq |I| \leq 2^M$ may belong to $\mathcal{D}_M$ and the previous argument can not be used. Instead, we reason as follows. The terms under consideration in the expression of $K(x,t)-K(x,t')$ are given by those intervals $I \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $I_{x,t} \subset I$ and $2^{-M} \leq |I| \leq 2^M$. These intervals can be parametrized by size as $|I_k| = 2^k|I_{x,t}|$ with $-M-\log|I_{x,t}| \leq k \leq M-\log|I_{x,t}|$. Notice that, since $|x-t| < 2^{-3M/2}$, we have $-M-\log|I_{x,t}| > M/2$. We are left with the sum

$$\sum_{-M-\log|I_{x,t}|\leq k\leq M-\log|I_{x,t}|}\langle b,\psi_{I_k}\rangle(\phi_{I_k}(t)-\phi_{I_k}(t'))\psi_{I_k}(x)$$

By using $|\langle b,\psi_I\rangle| \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}|I|^{1/2}$, $|\phi_I(t)-\phi_I(t')| \lesssim |I|^{-2}|t-t'|$ and $|\psi_I(x)| \lesssim |I|^{-1/2}$, we can bound the sum by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|b\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{-M-\log|I_{x,t}|\le k} |I_k|^{1/2}\frac{1}{|I_k|^2}\frac{1}{|I_k|^{1/2}}|t-t'|\\
&= \|b\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{-M-\log|I_{x,t}|\le k} \frac{1}{2^{2k}}\,\frac{1}{|I_{x,t}|^2}|t-t'|\\
&\lesssim \|b\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} 2^{2M}|I_{x,t}|^2\frac{|t-t'|}{|I_{x,t}|^2} \le 2^{2M}2^{-3M}\frac{|t-t'|}{|I_{x,t}|^2}\\
&\lesssim 2^{-M}\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2} \le \epsilon\frac{|t-t'|}{|x-t|^2}
\end{aligned}$$

by the choice of x,t and M.

We note that in dealing with the case $K(x,t)-K(x',t)$ we make use of the analogue inequalities $|\phi_I(t)| \lesssim |I|^{-1}$ and $|\psi_I(x)-\psi_I(x')| \lesssim |I|^{-3/2}|x-x'|$.

Finally we must verify that $\lim_{|x-t|\to\infty} K(x,t)=0$. This will be done by similar arguments. As before, we have when $|x-t|>2^M$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
|K(x,t)| &= \Big|\Big\langle P_M^{\perp}(b), \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \phi_I(t)\psi_I(x)\psi_I\Big\rangle\Big|\\
&\le \|P_M^{\perp}(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\Big\| \sum_{\substack{I\in\mathcal{D}\\ I_{x,t}\subset I}} \phi_I(t)\psi_I(x)\psi_I\Big\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same parametrization as before, we write the second factor as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k\ge 0}\int_{I_k\setminus I_{k-1}} \Big(\sum_{j\ge k} |\phi_{I_j}(t)|^2|\psi_{I_j}(x)|^2\frac{\chi_{I_j}(y)}{|I_j|}\Big)^{1/2}dy\\
&= \sum_{k\ge 0}\Big(\sum_{j\ge k} |\phi_{I_j}(t)|^2|\psi_{I_j}(x)|^2\frac{1}{|I_j|}\Big)^{1/2}|I_k\setminus I_{k-1}|
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\phi_I(t)| \lesssim |I|^{-1}$ and $|\psi_I(x)| \lesssim |I|^{-1/2}$, we bound this by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k\ge 0}\Big(\sum_{j\ge k}\frac{1}{|I_j|^2}\frac{1}{|I_j|}\frac{1}{|I_j|}\Big)^{1/2}|I_k| = \sum_{k\ge 0}\Big(\sum_{j\ge k}\frac{1}{|I_{x,t}|^4}\frac{1}{2^{4j}}\Big)^{1/2}2^k|I_{x,t}|\\
&= \sum_{k\ge 0}\Big(\sum_{j\ge k}\frac{1}{2^{4j}}\Big)^{1/2}2^k\frac{1}{|I_{x,t}|} \lesssim \sum_{k\ge 0}\frac{1}{2^{2k}}2^k\frac{1}{|x-t|} \lesssim \frac{1}{|x-t|}
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for $|x-t|>2^M$ we have

$$|K(x,t)| \lesssim \|P_M^{\perp}(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\frac{1}{|x-t|},$$

finishing the proof.

8. Endpoint estimates

In this last section, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.19 by extending the previous results to the endpoint case. That is, we prove that the operators are compact as maps from $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, we also prove that under the special cancellation conditions $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$, the operator T is compact on $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

8.1. Boundedness of a Martingale transform.

We start by demonstrating the boundedness of a new Martingale transform. Its definition and the proof of its boundedness on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for $1 < p < \infty$ appear in the preprint [11]. We include here the endpoint result.

Definition 8.1. *Let $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ parametrized by dyadic intervals.*

Given $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, let $T_{k,n}$ be the operator defined by

$$T_{k,n}(f)(x) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{J\in I_{k,n}} \langle f, \psi_J\rangle \psi_I(x)$$

where, as usual, for each fixed dyadic interval I, $I_{k,n}$ is the family of all dyadic intervals J such that $|I| = 2^k|J|$ and $n \leq \mathrm{rdist}(I, J) < n + 1$.

In the proposition below, we prove boundedness of this modified Martingale operator.

Proposition 8.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$. Then, $T_{k,n}$ is bounded on $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover,*

$$\|T_{k,n}f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim 2^{|k|/2}(\log(n + 1) + \max(-k, 0) + 1)^{1/2}\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}$$

with an implied constant independent of f, k and n.

Remark 8.3. *By duality and the fact that $T^*_{k,n} = T_{-k,n}$, we have that $T_{k,n}$ is also bounded on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with*

$$\|T_{k,n}f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim 2^{|k|/2}(\log(n + 1) + \max(k, 0) + 1)^{1/2}\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and $\mathcal{P}_K(f) = \sum_{I\subset K}\langle f, \psi_I\rangle\psi_I$ be the projection operator. Then, we need to bound

$$\|\mathcal{P}_K(T_{n,k}(f))\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \sum_{I\subset K} \Big| \sum_{J\in I_{k,n}} \langle f, \psi_J\rangle\Big|^2 \tag{48}$$

In order to compute the sum, we use an argument that distinguishes between large and small scales ($k \geq 0$ and $k \leq 0$), with a slightly different argument in each case.

We first assume $k \geq 0$. In this case, the cardinality of $I_{k,n}$ is 2^k and so, every different interval I is associated with 2^k different intervals J.

Therefore, by Cauchy's inequality, the contribution of those intervals to the right hand side of (48) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{I\subset K} 2^k \sum_{J\in I_{k,n}} |\langle f,\psi_J\rangle|^2 \tag{49}$$

Now, we separate again into two different cases: when $J\subset 3K$ and when $J\not\subseteq 3K$.

1) In the first case, we show first that for different intervals $I\neq I'$, the families $I_{k,n}, I'_{k,n}$ are disjoint. We denote $I_n = I + n|I|$, which contains every $J\in I_{k,n}$. If $|I|=|I'|$ then, $I_n\cap I'_n=\emptyset$ and so $J\cap J'=\emptyset$ for every $J\in I_{k,n}$, $J'\in I'_{k,n}$. Meanwhile, if $|I|\neq|I'|$ then trivially $|J|\neq|J'|$ for all $J\in I_{k,n}$, $J'\in I'_{k,n}$. Hence the families are disjoint.

Then, by the disjointness of the families $I_{k,n}$, we have that every interval J in the inner sum in (49) appears only once and so, the subsum of (49) of terms corresponding to intervals I and J such that $I\subset K$ and $J\subset 3K$ can be bounded by

$$2^k\sum_{J\subset 3K}|\langle f,\psi_J\rangle|^2 \lesssim 2^k\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}|K|$$

2) In the second case, of intervals I and J such that $I\subset K$ and $J\not\subseteq 3K$, we have $\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)>|K|$. Now, for every $j\geq 0$, we denote by K_j the family of dyadic intervals $I\subset K$ with $|I|=2^{-j}|K|$. For every $I\in K_j$ we have

$$n+1>\ \mathrm{rdist}(I,J)=\frac{\mathrm{diam}(I\cup J)}{|I|}>\frac{|K|}{|I|}=2^j$$

We first show that, for every j, the union of disjoint intervals $J\in I_{k,n}$ when varying $I\in K_j$ has measure at most $|K|$. Clearly, for fixed I, the union of the disjoint intervals $J\in I_{k,n}$ measures $|I|$. Moreover, the union of the disjoint intervals $I\in K_j$ measures at most $|K|$. Then,

$$|\bigcup_{I\in K_j}\bigcup_{J\in I_{k,n}} J|\leq\sum_{I\in K_j}\sum_{J\in I_{k,n}}|J|=\sum_{I\in K_j}|I|\leq|K|$$

This way, the relevant contribution of this case to (49) can be bounded by

$$2^k\sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)}\sum_{\substack{I\in K_j\\ J\in I_{k,n}}}|\langle f,\psi_J\rangle|^2\lesssim 2^k\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)}\Big|\bigcup_{\substack{I\in K_j\\ J\in I_{k,n}}} J\Big|$$

$$\lesssim 2^k\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)}|K| = 2^k(1+\log(n+1))\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}|K|$$

We have now proven the desired bound when $k\geq 0$.

For $k \leq 0$ we reason as follows. The cardinality of $I_{k,n}$ is one and there are 2^j intervals $I \in K_j$. But now, up to 2^{-k} different intervals I of fixed size in the sum (48) are associated with the same interval J and so, with the same coefficient $\langle f, \psi_J\rangle$. Then, their contribution in (48) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{J \in I_{k,n} \\ I \subset K}} \min(2^j, 2^{-k})|\langle f, \psi_J\rangle|^2 \tag{50}$$

where j is such that $I \in K_j$ and now the intervals $J \in I_{k,n}$ appearing in the sum are pairwise different. Moreover, since $|I| = 2^k|J|$ and $|I| = 2^{-j}|K|$ and k, K are given, we have that, for every fixed interval J, k and j are given by each other through the relationship $2^{j+k} = |K|/|J|$.

We separate the problem into the same two cases as before: $J \subset 3K$ and $J \not\subset 3K$.

1) As before, when $I \subset K$ and $J \subset 3K$ we have

$$n \leq \operatorname{rdist}(I, J) = \frac{\operatorname{diam}(I \cup J)}{|J|} \leq \frac{3|K|}{|J|} \leq 2^{j+k+2}$$

Therefore, $j > \log n - 2 - k$ and so, the contribution to the sum (50) of this case can be bounded by

$$\sum_{J \subset 3K} 2^{-k} \min(n/4, 1)|\langle f, \psi_J\rangle|^2 \lesssim 2^{-k}\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}|K|$$

2) On the other hand, for those J such that $J \not\subset 3K$ we have that

$$n + 1 > \operatorname{rdist}(I, J) = \frac{\operatorname{diam}(I \cup J)}{|J|} > \frac{|K|}{|J|} = 2^{j+k}$$

and so $j < \log(n + 1) + k$. Moreover, as previously stated, for fixed j up to 2^{-k} intervals I are associated with the same interval J and so, we calculate the union of those intervals J when varying $I \in K_j$. If $j \geq -k$ then, from the different 2^j intervals $I \in K_j$, up to 2^{-k} of them are associated with the same interval J. Then, the union of those intervals J has measure $2^j/2^{-k}|J| = |K|$. On the other hand, when $j < -k$, there is only a single interval J associated with all intervals $I \in K_j$, which measures $|J| = |K|/2^{k+j}$. Then, the union has measure at most $\max(2^{-k-j}, 1)|K|$.

With all this, the contribution to sum (50) can be estimated as follows,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)+|k|} \min(2^j, 2^{-k}) \sum_{\substack{I \in K_j \\ J \in I_{k,n}}} |\langle f, \psi_J\rangle|^2$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)+|k|} \min(2^j, 2^{-k})\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \Big| \bigcup_{\substack{I \in K_j \\ J \in I_{k,n}}} J \Big|$$

$$\leq \|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)+|k|} 2^j \min(1, 2^{-k-j}) \max(2^{-k-j}, 1)|K|$$

$$= \|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{j=0}^{\log(n+1)+|k|} 2^{-k}|K|$$

$$= 2^{-k}(\log(n+1) + |k| + 1)\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}|K|$$

The proof of the proposition is finished.

8.2. **Proof of compactness.** We start with the proof of endpoint compactness under the special cancellation conditions.

Theorem 8.4. *(Compactness on* CMO($\mathbb{R}$) *under special cancellation). Let T be a linear operator associated with a compact Calderón-Zygmund kernel K such that T satisfies the weak compactness condition and the special cancellation conditions $T(1) = 0$ and $T^*(1) = 0$.*

Then T can be extended to a compact operator on CMO($\mathbb{R}$).

Proof. As in the proof of compactness on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, we make use of a wavelet basis $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ with L^2-normalized elements and the lagom projection operator P_M defined by said basis. By Theorem 2.11, we need to prove that $\langle P_M^\perp(T(f)), g\rangle$ tends to zero when M tends to infinity, uniformly for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ in the unit ball of CMO($\mathbb{R}$) and $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ respectively.

We recall that

$$\langle P_M^\perp(T(f)), g\rangle = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_M^c} \langle f, \psi_I\rangle\langle g, \psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I), \psi_J\rangle \tag{51}$$

and that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $M_{T,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|\langle T(\phi_I), \varphi_I\rangle| \lesssim C(F(I; M_{T,\epsilon}) + \epsilon)$$

for any interval I and any bump functions ϕ_I, φ_I adapted to I with constant C. Moreover, there is also $M_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on ϵ such that for any $M > M_0$, we have

(1) $F(I_i; M_{T,\epsilon}) = F(I_1, \ldots, I_6; M_{T,\epsilon}) < \epsilon$ when all $I_i \in \mathcal{D}_M^c$
(2) $2^{-M\delta}M^{1/2} < \epsilon$

In this situation, we are going to prove that

$$|\langle P_{2M}^\perp(T(f)), g\rangle| \lesssim \epsilon$$

with the implicit constant depending on $\delta > 0$ and the wavelet basis.

We first parametrize the terms in (51) according to eccentricity and relative distance as in the proof of Theorem 6.1, and obtain

$$\langle P_M^{\perp}(T(f)),g\rangle = \sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{J\in\,\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}\langle f,\psi_I\rangle\langle g,\psi_J\rangle\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle \tag{52}$$

where for fixed eccentricity $e\in\mathbb{Z}$, relative distance $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and every given interval I,

$$J_{e,n}=\{I:|I|=2^e|J|, n\leq \text{ rdist}(I\cup J)<n+1\}$$

In the remainder of this proof, we work to obtain bounds of (52) when the sum runs over finite families of dyadic intervals in such way that the bounds are independent of the particular families.

By Corollary 5.9 we have

$$|\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle|\lesssim 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)}(F_\epsilon(I_i)+\epsilon)$$

where $I_1=I$, $I_2=J$, $I_3=\langle I,J\rangle$, $I_4=\lambda_1\tilde{K}_{max}$, $I_5=\lambda_2\tilde{K}_{max}$ and $I_6=\lambda_2 K_{min}$.

Now we separate the study into the same cases as we had before.

1) We first consider the case when $I_i\notin\mathcal{D}_M$ for all i. Then $F(I_i;M_{T,\epsilon})<\epsilon$, and by Cauchy's inequality, we can bound the contribution of the corresponding terms to (52) by

$$\sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{J\in\,\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}|\langle T(\psi_I),\psi_J\rangle||\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|$$

$$\lesssim \epsilon\sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)}n^{-(1+\delta)}\sum_{J\in\,\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle| \tag{53}$$

Now, let $\tilde{f}=\sum_I|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle|\psi_I$ and $\tilde{g}=\sum_I|\langle g,\psi_I\rangle|\psi_I$, so that $\langle\tilde{f},\psi_I\rangle=|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle|$ and similarly for $\tilde{g}$. Then, for any measurable set $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_\Omega(\tilde{f})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2=\sum_{I\subset\Omega}|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle|^2=\|\mathcal{P}_\Omega(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(f)=\sum_{I\subset\Omega}\langle f,\psi_I\rangle\psi_I$ is the classical projection operator. Therefore $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}=\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}$ and, by a duality argument, $\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}=\|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$.

With this, we have

$$\sum_{J\in\,\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|\leq \sum_{J\,\in\,\mathcal{D}}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}|\langle f,\psi_I\rangle||\langle g,\psi_J\rangle|$$

$$=\sum_{J\,\in\,\mathcal{D}}\sum_{I\in J_{e,n}}\langle\tilde{f},\psi_I\rangle\langle\tilde{g},\psi_J\rangle=\Big\langle\tilde{g},\sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{I\,\in\,J_{e,n}}\langle\tilde{f},\psi_I\rangle\psi_J\Big\rangle$$

$$=\langle\tilde{g},T_{e,n}(\tilde{f})\rangle\leq\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}\|T_{e,n}(\tilde{f})\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}$$

$$\leq 2^{|e|/2}(\log(n+1)+|e|+1)^{1/2}\|\tilde{f}\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})}\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

where the last inequality is due to Proposition 8.2. Notice also that $\log(n+1) \leq 2\log n \leq 2Cn^{\delta/2}$ for a constant $C > 0$ large enough so that $\delta/2 \gtrsim \frac{1}{C}e^{1/C}$ with a universal implicit constant.

This way, the relevant subsum of (52) can be bounded by a constant times

$$\epsilon \sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)} n^{-(1+\delta)} 2^{|e|/2} (\log(n+1)+|e|+1)^{1/2} \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

$$\lesssim \epsilon \sum_{e\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-|e|\delta} |e|^{1/2} \sum_{n\geq 1} n^{-(1+\delta-\delta/2)} \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

$$\lesssim \epsilon \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

2) Now we consider the remaining cases. Actually, we will only explicitly include computations in the case that $I \in \mathcal{D}_M$.

We separate the study into the three usual different cases: $|J| \geq 2^{2M}$, $|J| \leq 2^{-2M}$ and $\mathrm{rdist}(J, \mathbb{B}_{2M}) > M$. We deal with the first case.

2.1) Whenever $e \geq 0$ we have $|I| \geq |J| \geq 2^{2M}$ and so $I \notin \mathcal{D}_M$ which we need not consider. Whenever $e \leq 0$, we know that $I \in \mathcal{D}_M$ implies $2^{-M} \leq |I| \leq 2^M$ and $\mathrm{rdist}(I, \mathbb{B}_M) \leq M$.

Then, we have $2^e|J| = |I| \leq 2^M$ and so, $2^e \leq 2^M|J|^{-1} \leq 2^{-M}$. That is, $e \leq -M$. As before we bound the corresponding terms in (52) by

$$\sum_{e\,\leq\,-M} \sum_{n\geq 1} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)} n^{-(1+\delta)} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}_{2M}^c} \sum_{I\in J_{e,n}} |\langle f, \psi_I\rangle| |\langle g, \psi_J\rangle|$$

$$\leq \sum_{e\,\leq\,-M} \sum_{n\geq 1} 2^{-|e|(1/2+\delta)} n^{-(1+\delta)} 2^{|e|/2} (\log(n+1)+|e|+1)^{1/2} \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

$$\lesssim \Big(\sum_{e\,\leq\,-M} 2^{-|e|\delta} |e|^{1/2} \sum_{n\geq 1} n^{-(1+\delta-\delta/2)} \Big) \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-M\delta} M^{1/2} \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \epsilon \|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

which finishes this case.

It is clear that all remaining cases, 2.2), 2.3), 3), 4), 5) and 6) in the notation of Theorem 6.1, can be treated similarly.

The general endpoint compactness result will be proven as soon as we show that the paraproducts T_b and T_b^* are compact as maps from $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

As in Proposition 7.1, we use a wavelet basis $(\psi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that each ψ_I is an L^2-normalized bump function supported and adapted to I with constant C and order N. Furthermore, we denote by ϕ a positive bump function supported in $[-1/2, 1/2]$ with integral one, and let $(\phi_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be the family of bump functions defined by $\phi_I = \mathcal{T}_{c(I)}\mathcal{D}^1_{|I|}\phi$. Each ϕ_I is an L^1-normalized bump function adapted and supported in I.

Proposition 8.5. *Given* $b \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$*, define the operators*

$$T_b(f) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle \langle f, \phi_I \rangle \psi_I \qquad \text{and} \qquad {T_b}^*(f) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle \langle f, \psi_I \rangle \phi_I$$

where ψ_I *and* ϕ_I *are as described above.*

Then T_b *and* T_b^* *can be extended to compact operators from* $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ *to* $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$*.*

Proof. For the proof of compactness of T_b, it is sufficient to verify that $\langle P_M^\perp(T_b)(f), g \rangle$ tends to zero for all $f \in \mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) = L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, uniformly in the unit ball of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ respectively. By (45), we have

$$\langle P_M^\perp(T_b)(f), g \rangle = \langle T_{P_M^\perp(b)}(f), g \rangle$$

Then, boundedness of $T_{P_M^\perp(b)}$ from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ implies

$$|\langle P_M^\perp(T_b)(f), g \rangle| \lesssim \|P_M^\perp(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

proving $T_b(f)$ to be compact from $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ into $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$.

The proof that ${T_b}^*$ is compact from $L^\infty_{\mathrm{CMO}}(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathrm{CMO}(\mathbb{R})$ is similar. Since

$$\langle P_M^\perp(T_b^*(f)), g \rangle = \langle f, T_b(P_M^\perp(g)) \rangle = \langle f, T_{P_M^\perp(b)}(g) \rangle = \langle (T_{P_M^\perp(b)})^*(f), g \rangle$$

it follows by the classical boundedness of $T^*_{P_M^\perp(b)}$ from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$, that

$$|\langle P_M^\perp(T_b^*)(f), g \rangle| \lesssim \|P_M^\perp(b)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \|g\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

This finishes the proof.

References

[1] M. Christ, *Lectures on Singular Integral Operators*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, Conference Board of Mathematical Sciences; Amer. Math. Soc., Washington DC; Providence RI, Vol 77, 1990

[2] R.R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, *On the Cauchy integral and related integral operators*, Investigations on linear operators and function theory, 99 unsolved problems in linear and complex analysis, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. LOMI, Vol. 81, 220–221, 1978

[3] M. Cotlar, *Continuity conditions for potential and Hilbert operators*, Cursos y seminarios de Matematica, Departamento de Matematica, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires, Vol 2, 1959

[4] G. David and J. L. Journé, *A boundedness criterion for generalized Calderón-Zygmund operators*, Ann. of Math.,Vol 120, 371–397, 1984

[5] E. Fabes and M. Jodeit and N. Rivière, *Potential techniques for boundary value problems on C1-domains*, Acta Math., Vol 141, Number 3–4, 165–186, 1978

[6] M. Fabian and P. Habala and V. Montesinos and V. Zizler, *Banach space theory. The basis for linear and nonlinear analysis*, CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC, Springer, New York, 2011

[7] Eugenio Hernandez and Guido Weiss, *A first course on wavelets*, CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, Florida, 1996.

[8] S. Hofmann and M. Mitrea and M. Taylor, *Singular integrals and elliptic boundary problems on regular Semmes-Kenig-Toro domains*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, Number 14, Vol. 2010, 2567–2865, 2010

[9] M. A. Krasnoselski, *On a theorem of M. Riesz*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk, Vol. 131, 246–248,1959

[10] M. Lacey and E. Terwilleger and B. Wick, *Remarks on Product VMO*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc, Vol 2, 465-474, 2006

[11] S. Pott and P. Villarroya, *A T(1) Theorem on Product Spaces*, preprint

[12] R. Rochberg, *Toeplitz and Hankel operators on the Paley-Wiener space*, Integral Equations Operator Theory, Vol. 10, Number 2, 187–235, 1987

[13] C. , Thiele, *Wave packet analysis*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, Vol. 105, 2006

[14] A. Uchiyama, *On the compactness of operators of Hankel type*, Tôhoku Math. J. (2), Number 1, Vol. 30, 163–171, 1978

Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Lund, PO Box 118, 22100 Lund, Sweden
E-mail address: `perfekt@maths.lth.se`

Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Lund, PO Box 118, 22100 Lund, Sweden
E-mail address: `paco.villarroya@maths.lth.se`

Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Lund, PO Box 118, 22100 Lund, Sweden
E-mail address: `sandra@maths.lth.se`